16-4

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BR 143 .P7 1803 v.3
Priestley, Joseph, 1733-
1804.
A general history of the
Christian church

J. Priestley

A general church history

v. 3

(or part II, v. 1)

A

GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

FROM THE

FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE

TO THE

PRESENT TIME.

By JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, LL. D. F. R. S. &c.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

Nactus sum præteritos dies non sõlum graves, verum etiam tanto atrocius miseros, quanto longius a remedio veræ religionis alienos; ut merito hac scrutatione claruerit, regnasse mortem avidam sanguinis dum ignoratur religio quæ prohibuerit a sanguine; ista illucescente, illam constupuisse; illam concludi, cum ista jam prævalet; illam penitus nullam futuram, cum hæc sola regnabit.

OROSIUS.

NORTHUMBERLAND:— Printed for the Author,
By ANDREW KENNEDY.

1803.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

The CONTENTS

OF THIS

VOLUME

PERIOD XXI.

FROM the Concluſion of the Council of Conſtance in A. D. 1418, to the Reformation, A. D. 1517. 1

Section I. *Of the Power of the Popes in this Period, and the Oppoſition that was made to it.* - - - *ibid.*

Sect. II. *The Hiſtory of the Councils of Baſil and Florence.* - - 16

Sect. III. *Of the Councils of Piſa and Lateran,* 30

Sect. IV. *Of the Pragmatic Sanction, and Concordat,* - - - 40

Sect. V. *The Hiſtory of the Huſſites,* - - 47

Sect. VI. *Of the Attempts to unite the Greek and Latin Churches,* - - 65

Sect. VII. *Of various Opinions advanced in this Period,* - - 77

Sect.

Sect. VIII. *Of the Clergy and the Monks,* 92
Sect. IX. *The History of Jetzer at Bern,* 103
Sect. X. *Articles relating to Church Discipline,* - - - - 115
Sect. XI. *Miscellaneous Articles,* - 124

PERIOD XXII.

From the beginning of the Reformation in Germany, A. D. 1517, to the Conclusion of the Council of Trent, in A. D. 1563. 135
Section I. *Of the Proceedings of Luther, till they attracted the Notice of the Pope,* *ibid.*
Sect. II. *The Progress of the Reformation from the time that Luther attracted the Notice of the Pope, to the Advancement of Charles V to the Empire,* A. D. 1519 - 156
Sect. III. *The Progress of the Reformation from the Accession of Charles V to the Empire, to the Citation of Luther to appear at the Diet of Worms* - - 183
Sect. IV. *From the Appearance of Luther at Worms in April* A. D. 1520, *to the Pontificate of Clement VII,* A. D. 1523 - 211
Sect. V. *The Progress of the Reformation from the Pontificate of Clement VII* A. D. 1523, *to the Meeting of the Diet at Augsburg* A. D. 8526. - - 218

Sect.

Sect. VI. *From the Meeting of the Diet at Augſburg* A. D. 1526, *to the death of Clement VII* A. D. 1534. - 295
Sect. VII. *From the death of Clement VII, in* A. D. 1554, *to the Eſtabliſhment of the Toleration in Germany*, A. D. 1559, 316
Sect. VIII. *Of the Anabaptiſts in Germany*, 336
Sect. IX. *The Hiſtory of the Council of Trent* 340
Sect. X. *Of the Reformation in Switzerland*, 375
Sect. XI. *Of the Reformation in the Low Countries*, - - - 383
Sect. XII. *Of the Reformation in Spain*, 388
Sect. XIII. *Of the Reformation in France*, 391
Sect. XIV. *Of the Reformation in England* 397
Sect. XV. *Of the Reformation in Scotland and Ireland* - - 414
Sect. XVI. *Of the Reformation in the Northern and Eaſtern Countries of Europe*, 418
Sect. XVII. *A more particular account of ſome of the Engliſh Martyrs*, - 432
Sect. XVIII. *Of the Unitarians in this Period* 452
Sect. XIX. *Of the Jeſuits*, - 464
Sect. XX. *Of the Waldenses in this Period*, 478
Sect. XXI. *Of the Bohemian Brethren*, 482
Sect. XXII. *Miſcellaneous Articles*, - 484

ERRATA IN THIS VOLUME.

N. B. *(b)* signifies *from the bottom of the page.*

p. 28 l.	5*(b)*	*for* time	*read* mean time
— 65 l.	5*(b)*	the	their
— 68 l.	12	Dermetrius	Demetrius
—105 l.	15	were	was
—153 l.	3	Echius	Eccius
—257 l.	1	London	Durham
—272 l.	2*(b)*	that	what
—323 l.	10	1556	1546
—346 l.	3	leaſt of all	eſpecially
—422 l.	2*(b)*	1724	1524

confined myself. I have even sometimes thought it proper, in order to give a clearer idea of the principles and spirit of particular times, and of remarkable men, to depart from the character of a general historian, and to be very particular in my recitals.

Notwithstanding what will be called my peculiar sentiments, and of course my bias in favour of them, I hope that the most prejudiced of my readers will not think me destitute of candour, even with respect to those who differ from me in the most important articles. I will even venture to say that no ecclesiastical history that I have seen is equally candid. My own observation and experience have, I hope, taught me the allowance that is due to the force of prejudice in the best disposed minds, and the absolute impossibility of access to truth in certain situations.

Who, in what are called the dark *ages*, could be expected to have the light that is now accessible to all persons, whether they take any pains in the investigation or not? They must have been men superior to most that have ever lived, if, at the time of the great schism, educated as all Catholics then were, they could have admitted a doubt of the immensity of the papal power, weak as we now see the foundations of it to have been, of the ne-

ceſſity of *one head* to the whole Chriſtian church, and of that head being canonically elected.

Conſidering the long and almoſt univerſal prevalence of the papal power, and of popiſh doctrines, it could not be expected that the firſt reformers from popery ſhould do more than correct the more prominent abuſes in doctrine or diſcipline, and that ſuch articles of the common creed as that of the *divinity of Chriſt*, ſhould remain untouched by them. It was even natural that, in order to ſhew their unwillingneſs to proceed to extremities, and to carry their difference of opinion farther than was abſolutely neceſſary, they ſhould expreſs more zeal than they otherwiſe would have done for all the doctrines which they held in common with the Catholics. By this means they thought to eſcape the imputation of *hereſy* and *ſchiſm*, of which they appear to have had the greateſt dread, always repelling the charge by declaring their aſſent to the decrees of the *antient councils*, as well as to the doctrine of the *ſcriptures*.

At the time of the reformation, tho' the papal perſecutions had been ſo dreadful as muſt have led many to reflect on the ſubject, how few were there, even of the Proteſtants, who ſaw the impropriety of the civil magiſtrate interfering in the buſineſs of religion, or who did not acknowledge the obligation he was under to ſupport what he thought to be

be the *cauſe of God*, and to puniſh hereſy with more ſeverity than any offence of a civil nature? Nay, ſtrange as it may appear, the horrid mode of puniſhing heretics by burning them alive was practiced alike by Papiſts and Proteſtants, by Cranmer, one of the meekeſt of men, in England, and by Calvin, a man of a more ſtern temper, at Geneva. The *branch cut off from the true vine*, they thought, was to be conſigned to the flames, and that without mercy.

All that we can reaſonably expect of the beſt of men, unhappily labouring under ſuch prejudices as theſe, is that they ſhould be truly ſorry to find themſelves under the neceſſity of having recourſe to theſe violent methods of ſupporting what they believe to be a *good cauſe*; and that they uſe every method of perſuaſion before they adopt it. This apology will not, however, apply to the caſe of Innocent III and his agent Dominic, to that of Philip II and the duke of Alva, or that of Gardiner and Bonner in England. Theſe men ſeem to have delighted in blood and torture. If we may judge from circumſtances, and the extent of their cruelties, they felt little or no repugnance to the horrid meaſures they entered into.

This principle will, however, I believe, go pretty far towards the exculpation of Gregory VII, and of Thomas a Becket. They really thought

they were engaged in the defence of the *juſt rights of the church*, againſt the powers of this world, tho' it was, no doubt, with a mixture (not perhaps diſtinctly perceived, or attended to, by themſelves) of ſpiritual pride, and worldly ambition; in maintaining their own power, as well as ſupporting the cauſe of God. If we expect that men ſhould engage in the cauſe of religion, or of patriotiſm, with a perfectly *ſingle eye*, having no other object than that which is profeſſed, we expect too much of human nature. The mind of man is a very complex thing, and ſubject to many influences, which are often not ſuſpected, or attended to, by the agents themſelves.

Tho' I have no doubt of the papacy being the *Antichriſt* of the New Teſtament, and that it is devoted to deſtruction, the character I believe belongs to the *power*, and by no means to all the *individuals* who have been poſſeſſed of it. Some of the popes, even after the power was moſt clearly antichriſtian, *drunk with the blood of the martyrs*, were men of excellent characters, truly pious and conſcientious, and at leaſt as free from the ſpirit of perſecution as the Proteſtants.

The Engliſh hierarchy during the reign of Elizabeth and the Stuarts, a period of more than a century, diſcovered a true perſecuting ſpirit; and the Puritans in England, and the Preſbyterians in Scot-

Scotland, ſuffered almoſt as much from Proteſtant biſhops as the Proteſtants had done from the Catholics. But notwithſtanding this, great numbers of the Engliſh clergy, in the worſt of times, were as truly pious and exemplary as thoſe who were perſecuted by this church. The Preſbyterians themſelves, and I fear every other denomination of Chriſtians, made a ſimilar uſe of civil power whenever they were poſſeſſed of it. But in all theſe caſes Chriſtian candour will make the ſame diſtinction between the power, and the individuals who belonged to the body that exerciſed it. However, when theſe great *offences come*, offences by which Chriſtianity is diſgraced, *woe will be to them by whom they come.*

Unfavourably as a Proteſtant, and an unitarian, I muſt neceſſarily look upon the prevailing ſentiments, and the actions, of the men who had the chief conduct of affairs during the greateſt part of the period of hiſtory that I have undertaken to write, and long as I muſt have contemplated it, I view it in many reſpects with much ſatisfaction. Dark, as it is generally conſidered, and certainly ſo with reſpect to the light of the preſent age, the Chriſtian world was never wholly deſtitute of men not merely of great *ability*, for this has been the ſame in at all times; but of *uſeful literature*, and even of a talent for writing, allowing for changes

in languages, difference of taſte, and opportunity of education and ſtudy. And, what is of infinitely more importance, there have always been examples of the pureſt piety and virtue in times the moſt ſuperſtitious; which ſhews the ſalutary influence of Chriſtianity in its moſt corrupted ſtate. The heathen world produced no characters that can be compared with many in the moſt unfavourable times of Chriſtianity. Of a principle of *piety* the heathens muſt neceſſarily have been deſtitute, becauſe they had not the very elements of it, in a knowledge of the unity, the attributes, and providence of God; and all their views being confined to this world, they could not have the comprehenſion and elevation of mind of thoſe who look beyond the grave.

In all hiſtory vice and folly are the moſt conſpicuous; but this is becauſe they are comparatively rare. What occurs every day, as the virtues of private life, paſs unnoticed by hiſtorians; in part becauſe they are common, and in part becauſe they are unknown. But judging of the paſt by the preſent, we may ſafely conclude that virtue has always been more common than vice, and that plain good ſenſe has always counteracted the tendency of ſuperſtition.

To read the avowed principles of ſome Catholics, a zealous Proteſtant would conclude that no

no crime could long burden their conſciences; ſince their indulgences and abſolutions would eaſily relieve them; and in too many caſes this was, no doubt, the effect of the prevailing maxims with reſpect to them. But this could never have been the caſe in general. In the worſt ages, I doubt not that the virtues of real piety, and extenſive benevolence, accompanied with humility, and heavenly mindedneſs, from attending to a future ſtate more than to the preſent, characterized not the greateſt number, for this is not the caſe at preſent, but a very great proportion, of Chriſtians, tho' hiſtory takes no notice of them.

Who can peruſe the *Memoirs of the life of Petrarch*, who lived in an age of as much ſuperſtition as any, and by which he himſelf was conſiderably influenced (as his attendance at the jubilee of A. D. 1350 is a proof) without concluding in favour of his character, eſpecially for the laſt thirty or forty years of his life, that of his numerous friends and correſpondents, who were in the upper ranks in life, and conſequently had had the beſt education their times could ſupply, and alſo that of the common unlettered peaſants in the neighbourhood of Vaucluſe, and therefore probably of the commonalty in Chriſtian countries in general?

Were we equally well informed with reſpect to other periods of hiſtory, we ſhould, I doubt not,

be convinced of the happy influence of Chriſtian principles on the ſentiments and morals of men, tho' neither then, nor at this day, do they prevent the commiſſion of very great crimes, by perſons either know nothing of Chriſtianity, or who give little attention to it; which, indeed, is the caſe of the generality of thoſe who make profeſſion of it. In the midſt of light they walk in darkneſs, ſhutting their eyes againſt it.

Dark and ignorant as we eſteem the middle ages to have been, they furniſhed abundant matter to exerciſe the intellectual faculties of men. The queſtions diſcuſſed by thoſe who were called *ſchoolmen* were, no doubt, of little importance in themſelves, and often excite a ſmile when they are mentioned, tho' they were of as much importance as many of thoſe that were diſcuſſed in the philoſophical ſchools of Greece, and they bore at leaſt ſome diſtant relation to a ſubject of infinitely greater moment than any that ever came within the view of heathens. They reaſoned about them with as much acuteneſs as was ever ſhewn by man on any occaſion whatever, and they led by degrees to that ſyſtem of rational *metaphyſics*, which is one great boaſt of the preſent age; and eſpecially of the Engliſh nation.

Other ſciences, as thoſe of natural philoſophy, aſtronomy, chemiſtry, and medicine, were at the ſame

ſame time in the ſame low and imperfect ſtate with that of theology; and it has been by the ſame ſlow degrees that error and prejudice have been rooted out of them all, and that good ſenſe, aided by the labours of thouſands, have contributed to their preſent advanced ſtate; which, however, is but that of infancy with reſpect to them all. Theology, therefore, in particular has nothing to complain of, nor does any objection lie to Chriſtianity on this account.

As it is in the order of providence, that man, and the world, ſhould arrive at their moſt improved ſtate by ſlow degrees, we have no particular reaſon to complain that this order has been obſerved with reſpect to eccleſiaſtical, any more than civil affairs, religion as well as ſcience. It is, no doubt, the beſt plan; becauſe it has been adopted thro' all nature by the wiſeſt and beſt of beings; and as we find a ſtate of childhood neceſſary to that of a full grown man, all that we complain of in the dark ages, with reſpect to ignorance, abuſes of power, and all the aſtoniſhing corruptions of Chriſtianity, may appear in time to have been neceſſary, as I obſerved on a former occaſion, * to "the perfect underſtanding, the firm eſtabliſh-

* See my *Discourses on the evidence of revealed religion*. Vol. 1. p. 20.

" ment, and conſequently to the happy effects of " it." As we value health the more in conſequence of experiencing ſickneſs, ſo we ſhall, no doubt, think more highly of the value of truth, from reflecting on the groſs ignorance that generally prevailed before the diſcovery of it; and valuing it the more, we ſhall be more attentive to apply it to its proper uſes.

Few things more excite the wonder, and often the ridicule, of rational Chriſtians, than the exceſſive mortifications to which many Catholics in the middle ages ſubmitted. We think it ſtrange that men of unqueſtionable good ſenſe, and of the pureſt virtue and piety, men who had no views to this world, but had their affections wholly raiſed to another, ſhould think themſelves obliged not only to deny themſelves the moſt innocent enjoyments of life, but voluntarily to inflict upon themſelves every hardſhip that human nature could bear; and that others ſhould hold them in the greateſt admiration, while we regard them with contempt, on this account.

But the opinion, originally heathen, tho' adopted very early by Chriſtians, that the mortification of the body was of eminent uſe to purify and exalt the ſoul, and alſo that the more we ſuffer in this world the more happy we ſhall be in another, took an early and a deep root in their minds; and

thoſe

thoſe auſterities certainly argued a great command of the natural paſſions, eſpecially with reſpect to ſenſual indulgence, ſuch as the generality of mankind are altogether unequal to. They who practiced thoſe auſterities were, therefore, very naturally the ſubject of great admiration to others; and conſequently their voluntary ſufferings were a ſource of complacency to themſelves. We alſo find, what was not unnatural, that Chriſtians thought it a ſhame that ſome heathens ſhould make greater ſacrifices of their eaſe and pleaſure to their falſe religions than they to the true one.

We ſometimes meet with the moſt exalted ſentiments of virtue and devotion, tho' bordering on extravagance, in the writings of thoſe who in other reſpects adopted the moſt abſurd opinions and practices. I read with admiration, and I hope ſome improvement, many things not only in Fenelon, Madame Guyon, and Thomas a Kempis, but even in Tereſa, and Gregory Lopez.

That thoſe who had been guilty of great crimes ſhould have recourſe to theſe auſterities, by way of atonement for their offences, is not at all extraordinary. For it was eaſier for a man to faſt, to wear hair cloth next to his ſkin, to go on a pilgrimage barefoot, or to ſcourge himſelf, &c. than to govern his paſſions, and correct bad habits, eſpecial-

eſpecially ſuch as had their ſeat in the mind, as envy, malice, and revenge.

We ſhall think leſs unfavourably than we ſhould otherwiſe be apt to do of the underſtandings of men who could adopt opinions ſo extravagantly abſurd as that of tranſubſtantiation and others, which are held as the moſt important articles of faith in the Catholic church, when we accurately trace, and duly attend to, the riſe and progreſs of them, as I have endeavoured to do in my *Hiſtory of the corruptions of Chriſtianity*. And certainly the ingenuity that has been ſhewn in the defence of ſuch abſurd doctrines is truly wonderful, and ſhews that it was not owing to any deficiency in the natural powers of the mind that led to the adoption of them.

It will be happy if temporate and juſt reflections on the ſubjects of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory ſhould teach us that *candour* which the events recorded in it will ſhew us to have been too often baniſhed from the Chriſtian world, and at the ſame time lead us to admire the plan of divine providence in conducting men by due degrees from error to truth, and from vice to virtue. The view of paſt events ought alſo to make us thankful that we live in an age in which we ſee the gradual diffuſion of intellectual light, and a better aſpect of things in a moral reſpect than has ever appeared in the world before.

before. It is a promiſe of greater improvement in ſucceeding ages, and of the fulfilment of the prophecies which announce a ſtate of great and permanent felicity in the *latter days* of the world, when *nation ſhall not lift ſword againſt nation, when men ſhall learn war no more*, and when the whole *earth ſhall be full of the knowledge of the Lord*.

But the moſt important reflection that the contemplation of the dark ages ſuggeſts to a Chriſtian is, that his religion has ſurvived all the abuſes under which it has ſo long laboured. Had it not been *founded upon a rock*, ſuch a tempeſt would have certainly overthrown it; and the revival of literature, and the preſent age of rigorous inquiry, would have been the utter extinction of it. No other religion ever had, or could have ſupported, ſuch a trial; but to rational Chriſtianity it has only been a furnace that has burned away its droſs, and exhibited it in a purer ſtate than before. After this its friends cannot have any thing to fear for it.

Some unſtable minds have, no doubt, been ſhaken, and many of thoſe who never knew, or felt, its value have rejected it; but tho' there have been among them ſome men of great ability, and ſcience, and not deſtitute of many good qualities, the generality of unbelievers are evidently profligate, perſons to whom the maxims of the goſpel

muſt

muſt be ungrateful; and few, if any, of the more learned among them appear to have given ſufficient attention to the ſubject, or to have been poſſeſſed of that kind of literature that is peculiarly requiſite for the inveſtigation. In others of them ſelf conceit, and a wiſh to be thought free from vulgar prejudices, have evidently given them a bias of the force of which they were not themſelves aware.

Thro' the whole of this part of the hiſtory, as well as the former, I have had a view to the inſtruction of young perſons, by giving them an idea of the great value of Chriſtianity, ſhewing its influence on the minds of thoſe who have received it, and how nobly it has led them to act, and think; raiſing them above the world, and all the honours and emoluments of it; eſpecially how for the *great hope that it ſet before them* they chearfully ſubmitted to bear the loſs of all things, and made light of the pains of death in every mode of torture. With this view I then dwelt more largely on the hiſtory of *martyrdoms* than Moſheim, and others whoſe hiſtories are, like this, profeſſedly only *general.* The ſame view has led me to be as particular with reſpect to the perſecution of the reformers from popery in all ages; and the examples of Chriſtian fortitude which they exhibited are no leſs ſtriking and inſtructive than thoſe of the primitive Chriſtians in the times of heatheniſm. Here I will

will take the liberty to recommend to my readers my edition of the *ſufferings of Mr. Marolles and Le Fevre*, at the revocation of the edict of Nantes in France, as furniſhing one of the moſt remarkable and intereſting hiſtories of the kind.

N. B. This Preface I wrote after the printing of the firſt of theſe additional volumes. I do not ſuppoſe that I ſhall have occaſion to add any thing further to the next volume, but I probably ſhall to the laſt, as the peculiar ſtate of things at that time may require it.

Northumberland, July 3, 1802.

THE TITLES OF SUCH BOOKS AS ARE QUOTED BY THE NAMES ONLY OF THE WRITERS.

Giannone's Hiſtory of Naples, tranſlated by James Ogylvie, 2 Vols. folio. 1729.

Bingham's Antiquities of the Chriſtian Church, in his Works, 2 Vols. folio. 1726.

Brandt's Hiſtory of the Reformation in the Low Countries, in Engliſh, 4 Vols. folio. 1720.

Robinſon's Eccleſiaſtical Reſearches, 4to. 1792.

Sueur's Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe et de l'Empire, 7 Vols. 4to, Amſterdam. 1730.

—— Do. la Continuation par B. Pictet, 3 Vols. 4to, Amſterdam. 1782.

Len-

Lenſant's Hiſtoire du Concile de Piſe, 2 Vols. 4to, Amſterdam. 1724.

—— du Concile de Conſtance, 2 Vols. 4to, Amſterdam. 1727.

—— De la guerre des Huſſites, et du Concile de Baſle, 2 Vols. 4to, Amſterdam. 1731.

Moſheim's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory by Maclaine, 5 Vols. 8vo. 1774.

Laval's Hiſtory of the reformation in France, 6 Vols. 8vo. 1737.

Crantz's Hiſtory of the Bohemian brethren, by B. La Trobe, 8vo. 1780.

Beauſobre's Hiſtoire de la Roformation &c. 4 Vols. 8vo. Berlin. 1785.

Neal's Hiſtory of the Puritans, by Dr. Toulmin, 5 Vols. 8vo. 1793.

Fleury's Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſtique, avec la Continuation, 33 Vols. 12mo. Bruſſels. 1723.

Baſnage's Hiſtoire des Juifs, 15 Vols. 12mo. La Haye. 1716.

Williams's Hiſtory of Church muſic, prefixed to his Pſalmody.

Burnet's Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Church of England, abridged, 3 Vols. 12mo. 1728.

couraged by this circumſtance, the people of Conſtantinople inſiſted upon their patriarch anathematizing Severus, and with this he thought proper to comply. Alſo a council being called in this city, the ſame was done by all the biſhops aſſembled on the occaſion. By the acceſſion of this orthodox emperor, the church of Conſtantinople was reconciled to that of Rome, after a ſeparation of fifty-three years; the patriarch having ſigned the formulary preſcribed by the pope, in which the condemnation of Acacius and his followers was a principal article. The common people of Conſtantinople expreſſed the greateſt joy on the occaſion. But it was not without much difficulty that the church of Antioch could be reconciled to the new ſyſtem, and to the new biſhop that was appointed on the occaſion. Severus, making his eſcape to Alexandria, was well received by Timothy the patriarch of the place.

Notwithſtanding all that had paſſed on the ſubject, the legates of pope Hormiſdas in A. D. 519 found Conſtantinople warmly agitated by a diſpute with the monks, protected by count Vitalian, tho' oppoſed by his rival Juſtinian, who ſung the triſagion with their addition, implying that one of the trinity was crucified, and maintained that they did it agreeably to the doctrine of the Fathers, and in oppoſition to Neſtorius and

Theodore of Mopſueſtia. The monks receiving no ſatisfaction in a conference with the pope's legates at Conſtantinople went to Rome, but being as much diſſatisfied with their reception there, they returned to Conſtantinople. Alſo a great number of the Eaſtern biſhops would not conſent to the condemnation of thoſe who died after Acacius. No threats or puniſhments they declared ſhould induce them to ſtrike the names of their biſhops from their diptychs.

John Maxentius, the moſt learned of the monks who went to Rome, wrote on the occaſion, maintaining that whoever did not ſay that *one of the trinity*, not *one perſon in the trinity* (for there was artifice, he ſaid, in that form of expreſſion) was crucified for us, was a heretic, and a Neſtorian, tho' it ſhould be the pope himſelf.

Juſtinian, who ſucceeded Juſtin in A. D. 527, like him, made profeſſion of the ſtricteſt orthodoxy. Yet in the confeſſion which he gave of his faith at the commencement of his reign, he ſaid that one of the trinity was incarnate, tho' he had before blamed the monks of Scythia for uſing that expreſſion.

In A. D. 533 there aroſe a ſchiſm among the Eutychians, Severus, the exiled patriarch of Antioch, maintaining that the body of Chriſt was corruptible; ſince, otherwiſe, there could be no real ſuf-

ſuffering, which is Manicheiſm; whereas Julian of Halicarnaſſus, who had likewiſe taken refuge in Egypt, maintained that, according to the genuine principles of Eutychianiſm, the body of Chriſt was incorruptible; ſince, otherwiſe there would be a diſtinction between the body of Chriſt, and the logos, and conſequently two natures in Chriſt. "Why elſe," ſaid he, "do we reprobate the council of Chalcedon?" Thoſe two leaders of the oppoſite parties wrote againſt each other. The diſciples of Severus were by their opponents called *Corrupticoles*, or worſhippers of what was corruptible, and the other were called *Incorruptibles*, or *Phantaſiaſtes*.

Timothy, the patriarch of Alexandria, dying at this time, the partiſans of Severus, the clergy, and alſo the imperial miniſters, joined in the choice of Theodoſius, a man of letters. But the monks and the populace choſe Gajanus a diſciple of Julian. Theodoſius, however, having the countenance of the imperial party, Gajanus was baniſhed. Notwithſtanding this, few would communicate with Theodoſius, and many perſons being killed in a tumult which aroſe on this occaſion, he fled to Conſtantinople; but not promiſing to receive the council of Chalcedon, he was baniſhed to the diſtance of ſix miles from the city.

The emperor, willing to reconcile the Severians to the Catholic church, appointed a conference for that purpoſe at Conſtantinople, in A. D. 532. On this occaſion theſe Eutychians made no difficulty of ſaying that Eutyches himſelf was a heretic, but they diſapproved of the council of Chalcedon, as having introduced a new phraſe viz. that of *two natures in Chriſt;* whereas they maintained that after the union of the logos with the body of Chriſt, they made but one nature. They alſo complained that Theodoret and Ibas were then received as Catholics. In the laſt day of this conference the emperor himſelf attended, and after much argumentation brought over ſome of the Eutychians, but not all of them.

About this time ſome monks of the monaſtery of Acemites, and Hypatian, archbiſhop of Epheſus, being ſent by the emperor, met at Rome, to conſult the pope on the propriety of two forms of expreſſion introduced into the controverſy, viz. whether theſe monks did right to ſay that "the "virgin Mary was properly the mother of God," and that "one of the trinity was incarnate;" the emperor having publiſhed an edict in which they were condemned. Ferrand, a deacon of the church of Carthage, and a diſciple of Fulgentius, who was then dead, being conſulted, approved of the expreſſion "one of the trinity ſuffered," provided it

it was properly explained, and it was underſtood that he ſuffered *in the fleſh*.

Fulgentius himſelf having been conſulted on the ſubject of the incorruptibility of the body of Chriſt, gave it as his opinion, that during his life time it was ſo far corruptible, as to be ſubject to the infirmities of other men; but that it was incorruptible after his death; and alſo that during his life he was not ſubject to thoſe paſſions which diſturb the exerciſe of reaſon.

Pope John, not being able to bring the monks who had gone to Rome to hear what he thought to be reaſon, excommunicated them, as they had been before by the patriarch of Conſtantinople. On this occaſion the pope expreſſed his approbation of the edict of the emperor, and he wrote to the ſenate of Rome to explain his principles and conduct.

On the death of Epiphanius of Conſtantinople, Anthemus biſhop of Trebiſond was choſen in his place, and both he and the empreſs Theodora were enemies of the council of Chalcedon. This encouraged the Acephali to come to Conſtantinople and among them Severus late patriarch of Antioch; and there they not only held aſſemblies in private houſes, but alſo baptized. Pope Agapit coming to Conſtantinople at this time, on an embaſſy from king Theodoric, was ſo much offend-

ed at this, that he not only refuſed to communicate with Anthimus, but get him depoſed; when he retired to a place where he was under the protection of the empreſs. Anthimus was ſucceeded by Mennas of Alexandria, who received the council of Chalcedon. In execution of the ſentence of the council by which Anthimus was depoſed the emperor forbade him, and alſo Severus, Peter of Apamea, and Zoara a monk of Syria to reſide in Conſtantinople, or any conſiderable city. He alſo ordered the writings of Severus to be burned, and that whoever copied them ſhould have his thumbs cut off.

Pope Agapit dying at Conſtantinople, the empreſs got Vigilius to be made pope, and Silverius who had been choſen baniſhed. Vigilius, however, only in ſecret appeared to favour the views of the empreſs; as in all his public edicts he was ſufficiently Catholic.

We now find the council of Chalcedon, being favoured by the pope, and the emperor, univerſally received. Theodoſius of Alexandria, where it had long been reprobated, being baniſhed, Paul, who declared his approbation of the council, was choſen in his place; and Paul being depoſed for certain offences, was ſucceeded by Zoilus, who alſo received the council.

Theo-

Theodoſius, late of Alexandria, being at Conſtantinople, maintained that Chriſt was not ignorant of the day of judgment, not even *as the ſon*, uſing the language of the Catholics, tho' an Eutychian. He even wrote againſt thoſe who held the contrary opinion, calling them, in contempt, *Agnoites*, which from this time became another diſtinction among the Eutychians.

About this time Philoponus of Alexandria, maintaining that there was no difference between the terms *nature* and *hypoſtaſis*, was charged with admitting *three natures* in the trinity; and, allowing, as they ſay, the conſequence he was deemed a *tritheiſt*.

The controverſy about Eutychianiſm was but little heard of in the Weſt. However, at the ſecond council at Seville in A. D. 619, there was preſent a Syrian biſhop of the ſect of the Acephali, denying the diſtinction of two natures in chriſt, and maintaining that the divinity was paſſible; but with ſome difficulty he was brought to renounce thoſe offenſive opinions.

Notwithſtanding all that Juſtinian had done in favour of the council of Chalcedon, and againſt Eutychianiſm, ſuch hold had the principles of this ſect taken on the minds of numbers, and, as it ſhould ſeem, of the more zealous Chriſtians, advocates for the higheſt honours of Chriſt, that tow-

ards the end of his reign he himſelf was much impreſſed by them. The empreſs Theodora, as well as Theodore of Cappadocia, was an advocate for them; and in addition to their influence which was probably conſiderable, he is ſaid to have learned ſomething of this kind from ſome Originiſts, who, we ſhall find, became very conſiderable at this time. It is certain that Juſtinian adopted the opinion that the body of Chriſt was incorruptible, that after it was formed in the womb of the virgin it ſo far partook of the properties of divinity, as to be incapable of change, even with reſpect to the natural and innocent affections of humanity, as thoſe of hunger and thirſt; ſo that even before his death, as well as after his reſurrection, he ate without neceſſity.

As all the emperors wiſhed to think for their ſubjects as well as for themſelves, Juſtinian was not ſatisfied without endeavouring to make his ſentiments the ſtandard of faith in the whole empire; and for this purpoſe he had recourſe to the univerſal argument of ſovereign princes. He began by publiſhing an edict on the ſubject, deſigned to gain the biſhops; but it had little effect. The patriarch of Conſtantinople, Eutychius, was ſo far from ſubſcribing to this edict, that he remonſtrated againſt it, maintaining that on the emperor's principles the incarnation was only imaginary, and that it

was

was in no other ſenſe true than that the body of Chriſt was incapable of any ſtain of ſin, and was not corruptible in the grave.

The emperor was ſo much provoked at this oppoſition, which, coming from the patriarch of Conſtantinople, was likely to have a great effect, that he had him dragged by force from his church, and confined to a monaſtery. He was afterwards removed from place to place, and at laſt to Amaſa in Pontus. John the Syrian, ſurnamed Scholaſticus, was made patriarch in his place.

This oppoſition to the views of the emperor was not confined to the patriarch. Many other biſhops refuſed to ſubſcribe to his edict. Of thoſe the principal was Anaſtaſius of Antioch. The emperor uſed all his endeavours to gain him, but theſe being without effect, he would have been baniſhed, like the patriarch of Conſtantinople, if the emperor himſelf had not died before it could take place.

Juſtin II, the nephew of Juſtinian, who ſucceeded him in the empire, recalled all thoſe exiles, except Eutychius. This emperor, like his predeceſſors, thought proper to publiſh a confeſſion of his faith, and one by which he hoped to unite all parties; but it was without effect, as he only propoſed that all things ſhould remain on their an-

tient footing. Juſt before the death of Juſtin, and the ſucceſſion of Tiberius, Eutychius was recalled, after paſſing twelve years in a monaſtery at Amaſa in Pontus, and he entered Conſtantinople in triumph, riding on an aſs, in imitation of our Saviour, to the great joy of the people.

I ſhall conclude this ſection with obſerving that from a diſciple of Severus called Jacob Zanzales, or Bardai, a Syrian monk, the Eutychians in general came to be called *Jacobites*. And theſe about this time uſually called their opponents *Melchites*, on account of their receiving the council of Chalcedon, impoſed by *royal* authority, and in this it will have been ſeen there was too much of truth.

SECTION II.

Of the Controverſy relating to the three Chapters.

NOTWITHSTANDING the ſuppreſſion of unitarianiſm in a variety of forms, we find it appearing again in others, or other doctrines bordering upon it. The Neſtorians were but little different from unitarians with reſpect to their doctrine concerning the perſon of Chriſt, tho' they held a trinity in the godhead, and they were treated as

as ſuch by their adverſaries. And whenever the Eutychians, or thoſe who ſecretly favoured their opinions, prevailed, every perſon was conſidered as heretical, and was charged with Neſtorianiſm, who ſcrupled to adopt the very higheſt language concerning the perſon of Chriſt in all its parts, without excepting what related to his humanity. Alſo, in order to revenge themſelves for their diſappointment in the council of Chalcedon, they were eager to cenſure many of the eminent biſhops who lived at the time of that council, for language which had paſſed without any cenſure when it was uſed; and the circumſtances of the times favouring them, great diſturbance was given to the whole Chriſtian world on this account. The [illegible] who by their writings were particularly obnoxious to the favourers of Eutychianiſm were Diodorus of Tarſus, Theodore of Mopſueſtia, Theodoret of Cyrus, Ibas of Edeſſa, and Eutherius of Tiana, all then dead.

That ſome of theſe perſons enjoyed a high degree of popularity, at leaſt in their own churches, is evident from the diſtinguiſhed honours paid to the memory of Theodoret by Sergius one of his ſucceſſors. For in A. D. 519 he carried his image mounted on a car into the church, where it was received with ſinging of pſalms. He afterwards inſtituted a feſtival in his honour, and that of

Diodo-

Diodorus of Tarſus, and Theodore of Mopſueſtia. And had it not being owing to private pique, theſe men might have enjoyed their honours undiſturbed, and unenvied, to the lateſt poſterity.

The firſt time that we find the names of any of the perſons abovementioned made uſe of for any invidious purpoſe, was by Xenias, who had been made biſhop of Hierapolis, whoſe ſentiments were of the Eutychian caſt. Being at variance with Flavian biſhop of Antioch, he accuſed him of Neſtorianiſm. To ward off this accuſation, Flavian did not heſitate to anathematize Neſtorius himſelf, and his doctrine. But this did not ſatisfy Xenias, who farther required him to anathematize all thoſe who had been ſuſpected of holding the ſame principles, naming Theodoret, and the other perſons abovementioned.

This, however, was nothing more than an altercation between theſe two biſhops. The Chriſtian world became intereſted in the queſtion by the artful management of Theodore of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, then in the court of the emperor Juſtinian, who like ſeveral of his predeceſſors, and the ſucceeding emperors, buſied themſelves more about matters of theology than affairs of ſtate. This Theodore was a favourer of the ſentiments of Origen, (againſt which Theodore of Mopſueſtia had written) and one of the Acephali, and he had a diſ-

a diſpute on theſe ſubjects with Pelagius, when he was ſent from Rome on an embaſſy to Conſtantinople. Theodore, finding the emperor writing againſt the Acephali, and in defence of the council of Chalcedon, perſuaded him that he would reconcile the Acephali to the council (which had given offence to many by the ſeeming approbation of the writings of Theodore of Mopſueſtia, and a letter of Ibas to Maris a Perſian heretic, which he ſaid were evidently Neſtorian) if he would procure the condemnation of thoſe writers, and that by this means, uniting the different ſects of Chriſtians, he would gain immortal glory. The emperor, not perceiving his ſecret views, undertook to do this, adding to the two writers abovementioned what Theodoret wrote in anſwer to the twelve anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria. Abandoning, therefore, his deſign of writing againſt the Acephali, he compoſed another work, in condemnation of thoſe three writings, uſually denominated *the three chapters*. This piece of the emperor's was in the form of an edict, or letter addreſſed to all the churches, and bore the title of a confeſſion of faith. In this he anathematized not only the three chapters, but, as was uſual in thoſe times, all who defended them. This was in A. D. 546.

All

All the biſhops were required to ſubſcribe to this confeſſion of faith, tho' Mennas patriarch of Conſtantinople made ſome difficulty of doing it, on account of its implying ſome reflection on the council of Chalcedon. Ephrem of Antioch did not do it till he was threatened with expulſion from his ſee. Peter of Jeruſalem alſo made his objections, but nevertheleſs complied with the imperial requiſition, and many entered their proteſts againſt the ſubſcription. The biſhops who complied were rewarded, and they who perſiſted in refuſing to do ſo were baniſhed. Zoilus biſhop of Alexandria complained afterwards to the pope, that he alſo had been compelled to ſubſcribe.

Theſe compulſive meaſures had leſs effect in the Weſt. Four hundred biſhops in Africa could not by any means be brought to condemn, as they declared, perſons who were dead; eſpecially conſidering that in condemning them they might, in effect, approve of Eutychianiſm; and they remonſtrated on the ſubject to the emperor.

The pope, Vigilius, was by no means diſpoſed to join with the emperor in theſe violent meaſures. Being at Conſtantinople, he refuſed for ſome time to communicate with the patriarch Mennas, becauſe he had concurred in the condemnation of the three chapters. He even paſſed a ſentence of condemnation againſt the empreſs and the Acephali.

At

At length, however, being hard preſſed, he was induced to join in the condemnation of the three chapters; but, as he added, "without prejudice "to the council of Chalcedon," and he charged all perſons to forbear diſcuſſing the ſubject by ſpeaking or writing.

This conduct of the pope gave no ſatisfaction to either of the two parties, and gave great offence to the advocates for the three chapters, who were very numerous, and even to ſome of his own clergy, eſpecially Ruſticus and Sebaſtian, who maintained, in a publication on the ſubject, that the pope had abandoned the council of Chalcedon. The pope, however, acted with ſpirit on the occaſion, and in a ſtrong remonſtrance, in which he charged thoſe two preſbyters with groſs inconſiſtency, he pronounced them excommunicated.

The advocates for the three chapters in the mean time were not inactive. For they held a council in Illyricum in A. D. 550, in which they condemned their enemies, and addreſſed a letter to the emperor. The year following the biſhops of Africa proceeded ſtill farther; and being aſſembled in council, they excommunicated pope Vigilius, as having condemned the three chapters.

After the pope had publiſhed his piece, which he intitled *Juſtificatum*, Facundus, a diſtinguiſhed African biſhop, then alſo at Conſtantinople, wrote in

in defence of the three chapters, addreſſing his work to the emperor. In it he defended every article in all the three chapters at great length, and admoniſhed the emperor not to interfere in eccleſiaſtical matters, as the emperor Zeno had done by his *henoticon*, which was the occaſion of much diſturbance in the church. The emperor, however, paid no regard to this well meant and ſenſible admonition, but continued to employ more of his time in adjuſting eccleſiaſtical controverſies than in the great buſineſs of the war, which, under the conduct of the great Beliſarius, he was at that time carrying on in Italy.

The pope, ſenſible of the offence that he had given by his *Juſtificatum*, and perceiving the attachment of the Weſtern biſhops to the three chapters, urged the emperor to call a general council, which, without any regard to what had paſſed, ſhould decide upon the queſtion, and that in the mean time all private diſcuſſion of it ſhould be ſuſpended. To this propoſal he acceded, and the pope formally withdrew his *Juſtificatum*.

Notwithſtanding the imperial prohibition, not to diſcuſs the queſtion of the three chapters, the pope was ſtrongly urged to join the Greeks in the condemnation of them, even tho' the biſhops of Africa, Illyricum, and Dalmatia refuſed to do it; and perſiſting in his refuſal ſo much open violence

was

was uſed to him, that he thought it neceſſary to take refuge under the altar in the church; and from this ſanctuary he was dragged by his hair, beard, and feet. In the ſtruggle ſome of the pillars of the altar were broken, ſo that the holy table would have fallen upon him, but that ſome of the clergy ſupported it, and at length the people, ruſhing into the church, put an end to the indecent conteſt.

In conſequence of this violence, the pope prepared a ſentence of condemnation againſt Theodore of Cæſarea, the author of the diſturbance in A. D. 551; tho' it was not to be publiſhed but in caſe of farther violence, or his own death. After this, a kind of treaty was entered into between the pope and his adverſaries; but not being obſerved, and fearing farther violence, the pope made his eſcape from the place of his reſidence, by getting over a wall, and flying to Chalcedon, where he took refuge in the church of St. Euphemia. From this aſylum the emperor was deſirous of drawing him; but he refuſed, and the clergy of Italy, taking his part, drew up a ſpirited remonſtrance on the occaſion. At length Theodore made ſatisfaction to the pope, ſtill confined at Chalcedon, by declaring his acceptance of the four general councils, and Mennas and the other principal biſhops of the Eaſt joined in this acknowledgment.

At length, in A. D. 555, the council, for which ſo great preparation had been made, was held at Conſtantinople. At the firſt ſeſſion, or conference, there were one hundred and fifty-one biſhops, among whom were only five from Africa, and no other from any part of the Weſt. The iſſue of this council, as of all the preceding, might have been conjectured from the manner in which it was opened by Theodore, on the part of the emperor, explaining the motives of his conduct. He obſerved that "the Neſtori-"ans, no longer able to boaſt of Neſtorius himſelf, "had introduced his maſter, Theodore of Mop-"ſueſtia, who had advanced blaſphemies even "worſe than his, as alſo the impious writings of "Theodoret againſt Cyril, and the deteſtable let-"ter of Ibas, pretending that it had been approved "by the council of Chalcedon, which" he added, "they did, not for the ſake of defending that "council, but that under its authority they might "defend their own impiety. To oppoſe this de-"ſign," he ſaid, "the emperor had firſt conſulted "them at their reſpective ſees; but ſince, not-"withſtanding, there were thoſe who ſtill perſiſted "in maintaining thoſe three impious chapters, he "had convened them that they might declare their "joint opinion. Pope Vigilius," he ſaid, "had "condemned thoſe chapters ſeveral times, as alſo "Ruſticus, and Sebaſtian, who had once defend-

"ed

" ed them;" and he concluded with ſaying, that " they who deferred giving their opinion would " be conſidered as renouncing the profeſſion of the " truth, and that they who ſhould anſwer moſt " readily would be moſt agreeable to God." This ſpeech was a ſufficient indication of the diſpoſition of the emperor, if it had not been known before; and therefore judging from the hiſtory of former councils, it was eaſy to foreſee what would be the iſſue of this.

The pope, tho' then in Conſtantinople, and alſo ſome biſhops of Illyricum, declined attending this council, alledging that there were too few biſhops from the Weſt, and ſaid that they would give their opinions ſeparately afterwards. The Eaſtern biſhops, therefore, ſat without them.

At the firſt ſeſſion ſome writings of Theodore of Mopſueſtia were read, as particularly objectionable, and it muſt be acknowledged that they favour ſtrongly not only of Neſtorianiſm, but of downright unitarianiſm. In them it was advanced, that " when Thomas ſaid, *My Lord and my God*, " he did not mean Chriſt, but God the Father, " whom he praiſed for raiſing up Chriſt; that per- " ſons are baptized into the name of Chriſt as the " Iſraelites were into that of Moſes; that Chriſt " being the image of God, is to be honoured as " the image of a prince is honoured; that he is

" the adopted ſon of God, as other perſons are; " that the 21ſt and 68th pſalms did not refer to " Chriſt but to David, and that the angels attend- " ed upon Chriſt as the friend of God." On the bare recital of thoſe paſſages, without any diſcuſſion of them, all the biſhops cried out aloud " *Anathema to Theodore and his writings.* This " is contrary to the church, contrary to the faith, " this is impiety. One Theodore, one Judas."

They prefaced this decree of condemnation with obſerving, that, ſince the followers of Neſtorius ſupported their impiety by the authority of theſe three chapters, they were aſſembled to prevent that abuſe, " by the will of God, and the " command of the emperor." In fine, they condemned all the three chapters in the ſtrongeſt terms, anathematizing the writers of them, and all their defenders. No perſon appeared in defence of any of the three chapters, or oppoſed Theodore of Cæſarea in any thing, ſo that the decree of this council cannot be conſidered as any thing elſe than the act of the emperor. This council began its ſittings on the 4th of May, and ended the 2d of June the ſame year.

After the firſt day's ſeſſion, the pope gave his opinion, in a writing entitled *Conſtitutum*, addreſſed to the emperor, in which he joined the biſhops of the council in their condemnation of the *writings* of

of Theodore, but not in that of his *perſon*, as being dead, which he maintained to be contrary to the cuſtom of the church. He obſerved the ſame diſtinction with reſpect to Theodoret and Ibas. Sixteen biſhops ſubſcribed this writing of the pope, and alſo three deacons of the church of Rome. But the emperor was ſo much offended at this conduct of the pope, that he ordered his name to be ſtruck out of the diptychs of the church of Conſtantinople; obſerving, however, that he preſerved his union with the Apoſtolic ſee.

The pope had not the firmneſs to continue his oppoſition; but being borne down by the violence of the court, he acknowledged that he had done wrong in abſenting himſelf from the council; and he even ſigned his condemnation of the writers of the three chapters, and the defenders of them, as well as of the writings themſelves; retracting whatever he had ever ſaid or done in their defence. Having done this to gratify the emperor, he obtained of him, in return, a large conſtitution in favour of Italy, confirming all the donations that had been made to the church of Rome by Alaric and others.

The reception this council met with ſhews in what light ſuch aſſemblies of biſhops were conſidered; for it was of the ſame extent as the authority of the emperor, who directed its proceed-

ings. It was received by all the biſhops of the Eaſt, except Alexander of Abyla, who for his contumacy was depoſed. But in the Weſt, which was farther removed from the ſeat of power, many openly rejected this council, thinking that its decrees affected thoſe of the council of Chalcedon, and the variations in the opinion of the pope contributed not a little to weaken his authority in this caſe. This diverſity of opinion in the Weſt occaſioned a ſchiſm which continued more than a hundred years. The deacon Ruſticus even wrote againſt the decrees of this council, and for this he was baniſhed to Thebais. Thither he was accompanied by ſeveral perſons from Africa, where, as we have ſeen, many had entertained ſentiments unfavourable to this council. Facundus, perſiſting in his defence of the three chapters, was alſo baniſhed. There were other ſchiſmatics in Gaul, in Illyricum, and in Ireland.

Pope Pelagius, who ſucceeded Vigilius, puniſhed the ſchiſmatics of Italy by means of Narſes, who governed there for the emperor; and it is curious to obſerve in what manner he thought to eſcape the charge of *perſecution* on this account. Writing to Narſes on the ſubject, he exhorted him not to be moved by the "vain diſcourſes of "thoſe who ſay that the church perſecutes, when "it only puniſhes crimes, and ſeeks the ſalvation "of

"of fouls. They only perfecute," he fays, "who "compel to do what is evil. But fchifm is an "evil, which ought to be repreſſed by the fecular "power; and whoever is ſeparated from the "apoſtolic ſee is unqueſtionably in ſchiſm." He therefore deſired him to ſend all who were refractory to the emperor; for that ſchiſmatics ought to be puniſhed not only with exile, but by confiſcation of goods and ſevere impriſonment. The ſchiſmatics, however, were ſo far from being intimidated by theſe rigorous proceedings, that they excommunicated even Narſes himſelf.

The biſhops of Tuſcany were ſo much diſſatisfied with the conduct of the pope on this occaſion, that they ſtruck his name out of the diptychs of their churches, which was a virtual excommunication of him. And this ſpirited conduct of theirs ſeems to have made ſome impreſſion on him; for in a letter which he addreſſed to them on the occaſion, he gave a confeſſion of his faith, which he concluded with ſaying, that "he honoured as ca-"tholic the venerable biſhops Theodoret and "Ibas." He alſo ſent a confeſſion of his faith, with an account of the controverſy, to king Childebert in Gaul.

The biſhops of Iſtria, with Elias patriarch of Aquileia at their head, being particularly obſtinate in this ſchiſm, pope Pelagius addreſſed three let-

ters to them; but it was without effect. Afterwards the exarch compelled the ſucceſſor of Elias to enter into communion with John of Ravenna, who condemned the three chapters; but the people and the other biſhops were ſo offended at their conduct, that they conſidered them as apoſtates. The ſchiſm in Iſtria continued to the time of Gregory the Great. This pope who took great pains to put an end to it, held a council at Rome, for the purpoſe in A. D. 591, and particularly invited the biſhop of Aquileia to attend it. But the biſhops of the province held a ſeparate council, when they wrote to the emperor, referring themſelves to his judgment, but refuſing that of the pope, as a party in the cauſe. Maurice was then emperor, and he was ſo much moved by this letter, that he intreated the pope not to give them any moleſtation till Italy ſhould be at peace. Some perſons, however, in Iſtria abandoned the ſchiſm, and Gregory wrote in their favour to the exarch, and the biſhop of Ravenna, to prevent their ſuffering in conſequence of it; which implies that the country in general were favourers of this ſchiſm.

Theodelinda wife of Agilulf king of the Lombards in Italy was ſo zealous in favour of the three chapters, that becauſe Conſtantius, biſhop of Milan, did not expreſsly take the ſame part, ſhe ſeparated from his communion, and three of his biſhops

biſhops joined her in it. Pope Gregory, writing to her on this queſtion, and merely mentioning the *fifth general council*, which had condemned the three chapters, Conſtantius did not even think proper to preſent the letter; and in conſequence the pope wrote another letter, in which he made no mention at all of it; ſo far did this great pope think it neceſſary to temporize in this buſineſs. Farther than this, when the biſhops and citizens of Breſcia required Conſtantius to declare that he had never condemned the three chapters, the pope adviſed him to do what his predeceſſors had done before him, and abide by it; but, to ſatisfy the people, he wiſhed him to declare that he did not deviate from the council of Chalcedon.

It appears from the letters of Gregory, that there were ſchiſmatics alſo in Gaul, who withdrew from the communion of the church, on the pretence of adhering to the council of Chalcedon. Syangrius of Autun, who was ſent to Rome to receive the pallium from the pope, with the recommendation of the king, was of this number.

At length, in A. D. 603, Firmus biſhop of Iſtria renounced the ſchiſm, and wrote to pope Gregory to acknowledge it, notwithſtanding the utmoſt endeavours of Severus biſhop of Grada to prevent it. Maximus biſhop of Salonæ renounced the ſchiſm in A. D. 599. It appears there were

ſome remains of this ſchiſm in the church of Aquileia in A. D. 606, one of the biſhops of that diocese, named John, being ſuppoſed to defend the three chapters. Alſo Agreſtus, who ſeparated from the monks of St. Columban, went into this ſchiſm.

SECTION III.

The Hiſtory of Arianiſm in this Period.

WE have ſeen that almoſt all the barbarous nations bordering on the Roman empire were converted to chriſtianity by unitarians, or Arians, eſpecially the latter, when they were ſent into baniſhment by the orthodox emperors. This was the caſe with the Vandals, who, after traverſing Gaul and Spain, ſeized upon a great part of Africa. Unfortunately theſe Arians, having been perſecuted by the Catholics, became perſecutors in their turn. This, at leaſt, appears to have been the caſe with Genſeric, the firſt king of the Vandals in Africa, and his ſucceſſors. For other Arian princes, we ſhall find, were remarkably tolerant.

Genſeric began with forbidding the ordination of any Catholic clergy in the Proconſular province,

vince, and in Zeugitana, ſo that from being ſixty-four in number, they were, at the end of thirty years, reduced to three. He then obliged the Catholic clergy to deliver up their ſacred veſſels, and their books. He alſo allowed none but Arians to attend upon himſelf, or any of his children, and at length he ſhut up the Catholic church at Carthage, and baniſhed the clergy: for at that time there was no biſhop of the place.

This prince dying in A. D. 477, was ſucceeded by his ſon Huneric, who at firſt behaved towards the Catholics with much moderation; but afterwards became a moſt cruel perſecutor of them, and not of them only, but alſo of the Manicheans, many of whom he cauſed to be burned, and others baniſhed. The behaviour of the Catholics, however, furniſhed ſome excuſe for this ſeverity of Huneric. For the Catholic church of Carthage having been without a biſhop twenty-four years, he permitted the ordination of another, at the requeſt of the emperor Zeno, on condition that the Arians in his empire might have the liberty of exerciſing their religion, than which nothing certainly could be more reaſonable. Notwithſtanding this, the Catholics replied that on thoſe terms they choſe rather to have no biſhops, but leave the government of the church to Jeſus Chriſt. The commiſſary, however, took no notice of their

proteſt,

proteſt, and Eugenius, who had diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his exemplary conduct, particularly by his charities, was appointed biſhop, to the great joy of the Catholics, eſpecially the young people, who had never ſeen any biſhop in that ſee.

Leſt any of the Vandals ſhould attend divine ſervice in the Catholic church, it was ordered that no perſon in any other habit than that of a Roman, ſhould be preſent; and to enforce this order, perſons were appointed to attend at the door, who were directed to tear the clothes of, and otherwiſe abuſe, thoſe who attempted to enter in diſobedience to it. In the next place, he took away the penſions of the Catholics who were about the court, and obliged them to perform harveſt work, and other laborious ſervices in the country. He then diſcharged all Catholics from ſerving in any public office, and baniſhed them to Sicily and Sardinia. He ordered that the goods of the Catholic biſhops ſhould be confiſcated after their deaths, and that no perſon ſhould be choſen to ſucceed them till they had paid a large fine. But apprehending that the Arian biſhops in Thrace, and other places, would be treated in the ſame manner, he revoked this order. At length, however, he baniſhed all the Catholic biſhops to the number of four thouſand nine hundred and ſeventy-ſix, without any regard to the age, or the infirmi-

firmities of many of them. Thoſe who either would not, or could not, go, he ordered to be ſent into the deſert; and previous to this they were all aſſembled at Sicca, and Laſea, and put into a cloſe priſon, where they were ſubjected to the moſt diſtreſſing and diſguſting inconveniencies. After this they were driven, like ſo many beaſts, into the deſert, where they had for ſome time an allowance of barley, but it was afterwards withdrawn.

At length, in A. D. 483, the king ſent notice to the biſhop Eugenius, that finding that many, contrary to his order, had celebrated the Lords ſupper in the country poſſeſſed by the Vandals, to their ſeduction, with the conſent of his own biſhops, he ordered him to prepare for a public diſputation on the ſubject of their differences. The Catholics, foreſeeing that this meaſure was only a prelude to ſome farther perſecution, wiſhed to decline it, but propoſed that, if it ſhould take place, they might be aſſiſted by the Catholic biſhops of other countries. To this the king paid no regard; but on the contrary he took occaſion to baniſh ſeveral of the moſt learned of the Catholic biſhops in Africa.

On the firſt of February, the day appointed for the conference, ten perſons were choſen on each ſide to conduct it. Various difficulties ariſing, the Catholics gave in a confeſſion of their faith, with

with the reaſons on which it was founded. This was on the 20th of April. But inſtead of any other anſwer, the king, after complaining of their behaviour, made an order that every thing belonging to the churches of the Catholics, or to the biſhops, ſhould be given to the Arian clergy. He gave them to the firſt of June to make their ſubmiſſion, and after that he baniſhed them from Carthage, ſtripped of every thing belonging to them, and with a prohibition to every body to ſupply them with neceſſaries. In this diſtreſs they applied to the king in perſon; but inſtead of giving any attention to them, he ordered his horſemen to diſperſe them, and ſeveral old and infirm people were wounded. After this they were ordered to meet ſome commiſſioners from the king, who informed them that, if they would take an oath to maintain the ſucceſſion of the next heir to the crown, and not write to their friends in other countries, they ſhould have their churches and houſes reſtored to them. For, having been in power, it was highly probable that they had correſponded with the popes, and the emperors, in order to bring about a revolution, and of courſe a change in their favour. Thoſe, however, who took this oath were ſent into the country to cultivate the ground like ſlaves, and the reſt were baniſhed to Corſica, to cut wood for ſhip building. The

per-

perſecution then became avowed, and general; and it was conducted with all the cruelty with which the Heathens had acted towards the Chriſtians, neither age nor ſex being ſpared. It is to be obſerved, however, that we have no account of this perſecution except from the Catholics.

Among thoſe who were baniſhed on this occaſion, was Vigilius of Thapſus, who wrote many things in the name of Athanaſius, and others of the Chriſtian fathers on account, as he alledged, of his ſituation, not daring to write in his own name. Thoſe writings of his under borrowed names long paſſed for the production of an earlier age, eſpecially the famous *creed* which he aſcribed to Athanaſius, and which ſtill bears his name. Vigilius, however, going to Conſtantinople, wrote in his own name againſt Eutychianiſm.

Among other barbarities exerciſed on thoſe African Catholics, the king ordered the tongues of ſome of them to be cut out. But it is ſaid that, notwithſtanding this, they continued to ſpeak as well as ever. Victor of Vita, who relates this, ſays "If any perſon will not believe this, let him "go to Conſtantinople, where he may ſee one of "them, Reparatus, a ſubdeacon, who now ſpeaks "without difficulty, and who is on this account "held in great honour by the emperor Zeno."

Con-

Conſidering the many miraculous circumſtances, evidently fabulous, that are inſerted into the account of this perſecution, this particular circumſtance would not be entitled to any credit, had not a Platonic philoſopher, Æneas of Gaza, ſaid that he himſelf had ſeen theſe martyrs, and heard them ſpeak; and that he wondered not only that they ſhould be able to ſpeak, but even to live. This, however, muſt be an exaggeration, for if they had had no part of the tongue left, they could not have had the power of ſwallowing, and therefore without a conſtant miracle muſt have died; and as this philoſopher did not ſee them till long after the operation, they might have acquired ſome power of articulation with a very little tongue. The narrative adds, that two of theſe confeſſors having had to do with a common proſtitute, loſt the power of ſpeaking; and that one of them, who had never ſpoken from his birth, even when he had a tongue, began to ſpeak after it was cut out. Such an account as this certainly does not add to the credibility of the ſtory.

I have omitted the mention of many improbable circumſtances in the relation of this perſecution; but I ſhall notice one, as, like the reſt, it may ſhew us in what light other particulars in the narrative may be conſidered. Seven monks were ordered to be put into a veſſel filled with ſmall dry wood,

wood, to which fire was to be ſet when they were at ſea. But it was found impoſſible to fire this wood. The king, it is ſaid, ſeeing this, and being in a rage at it, ordered their heads to be broken with a bar of iron, and their bodies to be thrown into the ſea.

After ſo evident a miracle in favour of thoſe martyrs, it is not to be believed that even a Heathen perſecutor would have perſiſted in his purpoſe. Had Jeſus actually deſcended from the croſs, and preſented himſelf before the Jewiſh rulers, they ſurely would not have made any other attempt on his life.

A famine and a plague with which Africa was afflicted was conſidered as a divine judgment on account of this perſecution, and ſo was the death of Huneric in A. D. 485; his body being eaten of worms and falling in pieces, which, it is ſomething remarkable, was the caſe of ſeveral other perſecutors. The emperor Zeno ſent an embaſſy to Huneric on the ſubject of this perſecution, but without any good effect.

This perſecution ceaſed on the ſucceſſion of Gontamond. He recalled from exile Eugenius biſhop of Carthage. In the third year of his reign he reſtored to the Catholics of that city the burying ground of St. Agileus, and in his tenth year he allowed the opening of all their churches. His

brother Trasamond, who succeeded him in A. D. 496, endeavoured to gain the Catholics by rewards; but this not answering his purpose, he forbad the election of bishops to their vacant sees. Little regard, however, was paid to this order; and among others Fulgentius was ordained bishop of Ruspé, but he was immediately banished to Sardinia. After this the king sent for him, and proposed to him some difficulties, and tho' he gave the king no satisfaction, the Catholics of Carthage triumphed not a little on the occasion. The king sending him other queries, he answered them in a treatise which is still extant. After this he was remanded to the place of his exile.

On the death of Trasamond in A. D. 523, his successor, Hulderic, recalled all the Catholic bishops, and permitted them to open their churches. They were received with great joy by their Catholic friends, and especially Fulgentius.

The Catholics had little reason to complain of persecution to which they were always sufficiently inclined themselves, and when the Donatists recovered their liberty under the Vandals, it gave them great offence. The emperor Justin having ordered all their churches to be taken from the Arians, Theoderic king of Italy threatened to treat the Catholics in the same manner, and obliged the pope, who was his subject, to go in per-

ſon to the emperor at Conſtantinople, to get the order revoked, which he did, and ſucceeded.

On this occaſion, as well as on many others, religion was too often made a pretence for political meaſures. Clovis king of France made war on Alaric a Gothic king in Spain, with a view, as he ſaid, to extirpate Arianiſm; but no doubt to enlarge his dominions.

The Vandal princes were not, however, the only Arian perſecutors of the Catholics. Evaric, the Gothic king of Spain, perſecuted them, forbidding to ordain any biſhops in the place of thoſe who were deceaſed. He alſo baniſhed ſome of them, ſo that many of their churches went to ruin. Levigild, king of the Viſigoths in Spain, was exceedingly provoked that his ſon Hermenigild was made a Catholic by his wife. He baniſhed, and put to death, many Catholics; and at length proceeded to this extremity with his ſon, after promiſing him his life, but without effect, if he would conſent to receive the communion at the hands of an Arian biſhop. He alſo perſecuted the Suevi who inhabited Gallicia on their becoming Catholics. Afterwards he repented of the murder of his ſon, whom he did not long ſurvive, and even became a Catholic himſelf. He durſt not, however, acknowledge it, for fear of his ſubjects. But his ſon and ſucceſſor Ricared,

openly avowed himself a Catholic, and the conversion of the whole nation followed soon after. Thus ended the reign of Arianism in Spain.

Ricared become a Catholic, held a council at Toledo in A. D. 589, in which the king and all the bishops solemnly abjured all heresy, acknowledging the authority of all the general councils, and expressly rejecting the decrees of a former council held at the same place, and that at Rimini in Italy. And whereas the Arian bishops had been married, this was on this occasion forbidden to the Catholics. At a council held at Narbonne in Gaul, where were several of the same bishops who attended this council of Toledo, it was ordered that, after the recitation of every psalm in the public worship, the *gloria Patri &c.* should be sung, as a profession of faith, against Arianism. This was universally adopted by the Catholics, and it is in the liturgy of the church of England to this day.

In general it is acknowledged that the Arian princes were tolerant. Odoacer shewed the Catholics of Italy all possible indulgence, and so did Theodoric after him. Had he been a Catholic himself, he could not have behaved to the bishops and clergy of Rome with more equity and generosity. Also, while Trasamond was persecuting the Catholics in Africa, Alaric king of the Visi-

goths

goths in Spain, tho' an Arian, treated them with the greateſt humanity.

It is remarkable that, tho' all the nations that conquered, and ſettled in, the Roman empire were at that time Arians, they all afterwards, chiefly by the influence of the popes, became Catholics; and it is no leſs remarkable, that in many of the caſes women were the chief inſtruments in effecting the change.

In A. D. 516 Gondebold, the Arian king of the Burgundians, was ſucceeded by his ſon Sigiſmund, and he was converted to the Catholic faith by Avitus biſhop of Vienne. In A. D. 562 the Suevi of Spain became Catholics. In A. D. 591 Theodelinda the wife of Agiluf king of the Lombards in Italy, converted her huſband; and eventually all Lombardy became Catholic.

Tho' theſe northern conquerors are in general called Arians by hiſtorians, it is evident that there were many proper unitarians among them; and for any thing that certainly appears, the majority may have been ſuch. Of the Burgundians, whom St. Patient took much pains to bring over to the Catholic faith, it is expreſsly ſaid that they were *Photinians*. Alſo Chilperic king of the Francs was a Sabellian. This prince made an order that, inſtead of the term *trinity*, the word *God*, without any hint of diſtinction of perſons, ſhould be uſed.

But being oppoſed by Gregory of Tours, and other biſhops, he dropped that deſign.

When theſe kings found it convenient to become Catholics, the people did not always follow their example; and when we conſider the ſenſible reaſoning of the Arians on the ſubject, we cannot but be ſatisfied that the converſions were not the effect of argument. When Avitus addreſſed Gondebold king of the Burgundians, and exhorted him to return, as he ſaid, "to the law of God," and that then he would have peace with all his enemies, he replied "Becauſe I will not acknowledge three "Gods, you ſay I will not acknowledge the law "of God. I never read in the ſcriptures that "there are more gods than one." When he afterwards became a Catholic, he durſt not make open profeſſion of his faith, tho' urged to it by Avitus, for fear of his people, who were ſtill zealous Arians.

SECTION IV.

The Hiſtory of the Monks in this Period.

WE have ſeen in former periods of this Hiſtory what deep root the principles of the monkiſh ſyſtem had taken in the minds of the generality of Chriſtians. Unfortunately, they had learned

learned of the Heathens that they were to recommend themſelves to the deity by auſterity, and abſtract contemplation; that by theſe methods they attained the higheſt pitch of excellence to which human nature could arrive, every other attainment being of far inferior value. On thoſe principles many thouſand perſons, in all Chriſtian countries, had ſecluded themſelves from the world, and conſequently from all the duties of ſocial life, to employ themſelves in prayer and meditation, and in circumſtances in which life could barely be ſupported; thinking that the ſoul was elevated and refined by the mortification of the body.

But hitherto this buſineſs had not been reduced to any uniform plan. They who adopted the monkiſh life, tho' they retired from the world, mixed with it again whenever they thought proper, and voluntarily conformed to whatever mode of living they moſt approved, and theſe were very various. This continued to be the caſe in the Eaſt; but in the Weſt we now find a more regular ſyſtem adopted, the monks binding themſelves by ſolemn oaths to devote their whole lives to their profeſſion, to conform to a ſyſtem of rules, and to obey a ſuperior. In conſequence, too, of the monks forming themſelves into more regular bodies, under a few heads, we ſhall find them acquire more influence, and gradually obtaining ex-

emptions from the authority of the biſhops in whoſe dioceſes they lived, tho' as yet this was little compared to what they obtained in later periods.

This change in the affairs of the monks was made by *Benedict*, and his rules being univerſally adopted in the Weſt, it may be proper to give ſome account of the man, and his previous hiſtory.

Benedict was born in A. D. 480, of a good family, at Nurſia in Italy, and educated at Rome. Being offended at the wickedneſs of the times, he paſſed three years in retirement, unknown to any perſon, except one Romanus, who ſupplied him with victuals, while he lived in a cavern in a rock. By degrees, however, he became known to the neighbours, who ſupplied his wants, and received his inſtructions. His fame extending itſelf, many perſons put themſelves under his conduct; and for ſome time he undertook the charge of a monaſtery at Vicovarro. But the monks not liking his ſevere diſcipline, he left them, and went back to his former retirement. Becoming more and more diſtinguiſhed, he built twelve monaſteries, each conſiſting of twelve monks, and a ſuperior. At length, however, giving way to the envy of a prieſt, whoſe name was Florentius, he abandoned all his monaſteries, and removing from place to place, came at laſt to mount Caſſin in the country of the antient Samnites, on the declivity of which there

there was a ſmall town. Here he demoliſhed an antient temple of Apollo, to whom the people then offered ſacrifices, and built two oratories, one to St. Martin, and the other to St. John; and in A. D. 529 he founded there the monaſtery which was afterwards ſo famous. The following is an abſtract of Benedict's principal rules.

He had fixed times for public prayers, and they varied with the ſeaſons of the year. One of theſe times was in the night, as well as early in the morning. At theſe meetings for prayer the pſalter was recited every week, which he thought very moderate, as he ſaid their fathers repeated the whole every day with fervour. After theſe public prayers each monk prayed by himſelf, and the time that was not ſpent in prayer was employed in working or reading; and he ordered that there ſhould be ſeven hours for working, and two for reading, every day. If the harveſt required it, they worked more hours. The work was not, however, left to their choice, but was enjoined by the ſuperior; and from the nature of this work it appears that the majority of Benedict's monks were artiſans; and thoſe of better condition among them were required to employ themſelves as the reſt did.

With reſpect to their diet, they were not allowed either fleſh meat or fiſh, but they were not forbidden a moderate uſe of wine. They all per-

formed the ſervile offices of the family, ſuch as preparing the victuals in their turns. Their dreſs was that of the poorer people of the country, without any regard to the colour or length of their garments; but they had them out of a common ſtock at the diſcretion of the ſuperior.

All the monks ſlept in ſeparate beds, ten or twenty in the ſame room, or dormitory, in each of which was one elderly perſon to obſerve the conduct of the reſt; and that they might always be able to attend the public prayers, they ſlept in their clothes. No ſpeaking was allowed in the dormitory, and but little in the courſe of the day. Nothing of recreation is mentioned in Benedict's inſtitute; but after ſupper, while the reſt of the monks were ſeated, one perſon read to them in the lives of the ſaints, or ſome other book of edification. Theſe original Benedictines were all of the laity, Benedict himſelf not being in orders, tho' he preached. If any prieſt joined them, he was to be ſubject to the ſame rules with the other monks, except that he was ſeated next to the Abbot. They received the communion only on Sundays. They had no occaſion to learn Latin, as that was ſtill the vulgar tongue in Italy.

If any monk went out of the monaſtery, which could not be done without leave from the abbot, he

he was forbidden to ſpeak of any thing that was tranſacted without it.

Strangers were received into the monaſtery, and treated with great hoſpitality; and for this purpoſe the abbot had a table ſeparate from that of the monks.

The abbot was choſen by the monks, though ſometimes the neighbouring biſhops interfered, to prevent an improper choice; and when he was choſen, he was ordained by the biſhop of the diocese. He might conſult with the monks, but all the power was in his own hands. Under the abbot was a prior, and ſeveral deans, each having the inſpection of ten monks. Theſe were appointed by the abbot, and were not independent on him; as the in other monaſteries. There were alſo other officers, as in other great families.

A novice was not received till after a year's probation, and upon admiſſion he ſurrendered every thing that he was worth to the monaſtery, or to the poor.

Theſe rules were ſo much approved, that they were adopted by all the monks of the Weſt. As the religious life of Benedict began, ſo it ended, with the ſuperſtition of the times. When he found himſelf on the point of death, he cauſed himſelf to be carried into the church, and expired there.

There

There were in theſe, and eſpecially in later times, many other examples of this ſuperſtition.

Among thoſe who diſtinguiſhed themſelves as founders of monaſtaries in this period, were J. Gildas of Scotland, and S. Columban from Ireland. Gildas was born A. D. 484, and preached in the northern parts of Great Britain, then in Ireland, whence he paſſed into Gaul, where he eſtabliſhed himſelf near the city of Vannes, and built the monaſtery which ſtill bears his name, and of which in after times the famous Abelard was abbot.

Columban went from Ireland to preach to the northern Picts, but before this he erected a monaſtery at Dermach which became very famous, and another of ſtill greater celebrity at Ily or Iler in the north of Ireland. In theſe monaſteries Eaſter was not celebrated in the manner of the church of Rome. He lived thirty-four years after he left Ireland, and died A. D. 598.

S. Gal, the companion of Columban, eſtabliſhed a monaſtery which was called after his name in Swiſſerland, and was afterwards very famous. The abbots of it erected it into a ſovereignty, which continues to this day, and it is confederated with the Swiſs cantons. *Sueur*, A. D. 612.

The moſt diſtinguiſhed of the monks in the Eaſt in this period was Sabas, the great and active ſupporter of the Catholic faith. He found-

ed

ed ſeveral monaſteries in Paleſtine, the rules of which he left in writing. He was famous for his auſterities and his miracles; but the truth of them is rendered ſuſpicious by the manner in which they are recorded by his panegyriſt St. Cyril, who wrote his life. Ib. A. D. 530.

The firſt monaſtery for women, called in Engliſh *nunneries*, was founded in this period by queen Radegonda at Poitiers. She made her ſiſter Agnes the abbeſs, and the inſtitution was confirmed at the ſecond council of Tours A. D. 567, when an anathema was pronounced againſt any who ſhould leave the monaſtery, or thoſe who ſhould marry any of the women who entered it. Before this many young women had made vows of chaſtity, but they had lived with their parents, attended public worſhip in the churches, and even received viſitors, only diſtinguiſhing themſelves by a veil, which was given them by the biſhop of the place. Ib. A. D. 567.

Fleury, in his obſervations on the ſtate of monkery in this period, in which the monks worked, but did not beg, when they were ſubject to the juriſdiction of the biſhop of the dioceſe, and did not make a diſtinct order of men, ſays that "their life was the model of Chriſtian perfection." Vol. 8. p. vi. This ſhews how far his ideas were from the genuine ſtandard of Chriſtianity. No doubt much

much more reaſonable maxims prevailed in this period than ſuch as were adopted in later, and more corrupt, times. In all the monaſteries the article of labour was more or leſs attended to. At the ſecond council of Seville, A. D. 619, the monks were enjoined to work ſix hours in the day, and to read three. Their work was for their own ſubſiſtence, as well as for the poor. It was chiefly, however, in the garden, while the ſlaves were employed in the more laborious works of huſbandry and building, &c.

It is evident from the accounts we have of the diſcipline of monaſteries in this period, that there were great diſorders in many of them; many perſons being admitted who were by no means prepared for that mode of life. To correct theſe diſorders recourſe was had to corporal puniſhment; and among other puniſhments that of flagellation ſeems to have been moſt common. In the rule of St. Columban the uſual diſcipline was ſix ſtrokes of the whip for light offences, and for others in proportion, as far as two hundred, tho' never more than twenty-five at one time. Sometimes the monks were enjoined ſilence, or extraordinary faſting, but very frequently the repetition of certain pſalms.

Some care, however, was taken to prevent the introduction of improper perſons into monaſteries, and

and more eſpecially nunneries. At the council of Agde in A. D. 506, women were forbidden to take the veil under forty years of age. The emperor Maurice made a law forbidding ſoldiers to become monks, probably ſuppoſing that it uſually aroſe from a deſire to change a laborious and hazardous life for an idle and ſecure one. But pope Gregory did not approve of the regulation. Writing to him on the ſubject, he ſays that "by that means "he would ſhut the gates of heaven to many per-"ſons: for that numbers could not be ſaved with-"out quitting the world altogether." This ſhews how prevalent were falſe rules of Chriſtian duty in this period.

The number of monks we have ſeen to have been very great in the preceding periods of this hiſtory, but from the increaſing ſuperſtition, and the increaſing violence, of the times, which led many to retire from the world, their numbers were more conſiderable in this. Mention is made of not leſs than three thouſand and five hundred in two lauras, or places appendant to monaſteries at Scetis. (*Fleury* Vol. 8. p. 243.) and it appears from the letters of pope Gregory, that in A. D. 599, there were near three thouſand monks in Rome only.

Sacred as monaſteries were generally conſidered in theſe times, they often ſuffered greatly from the depredations of their neighbours, eſpecially of the Heath-

Heathens. The monaſteries of the Eaſt were laid waſte in the Perſian war in the time of Heraclius, and in A. D. 577 the monaſtery at mount Caſſin was plundered, and broken up by the Lombards. As monaſteries became wealthy, they were often too tempting an object to Chriſtian princes and lords in thoſe times. On this ſubject we ſhall find many complaints in the ſubſequent periods of this hiſtory.

Tho' M. Fleury praiſes the ſtate of monkery in this period, from the monks not being exempt from epiſcopal juriſdiction, it was only ſo in general. In A. D. 599, at the requeſt of the patriarch Theodore, who reſigned the church of Conſtantinople, the monaſtery to which he retired was exempted from all eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, except that of the church of Conſtantinople. In the third council of Arles, A. D. 461, aſſembled to determine a diſpute between the biſhop of the dioceſe and the monaſtery of Lerins, it was ſettled that the clergy and miniſters of the altar ſhould be ordained by the biſhop; but that the laity of the monaſtery ſhould not be ſubject to any juriſdiction beſides that of the abbot.

Monks, and eſpecially thoſe of the clerical order, were not ſo ſtrictly confined to their monaſteries in this period but that, at the call of the prince, they would quit them. For we read that Clo-

Clothaire demanded of his biſhop Sulpicius to do the duty of abbé in his army, which implies that monks were uſually employed by him there.

That, in general, monaſteries were well conducted in this period, and favourable to ſuch kind of piety as was held in veneration at this time, I have no doubt. But theſe places of retreat from the world, did not even then exclude ambition, and even ſuch as prompted to groſs violence, eſpecially when perſons of rank were members of them. This is evident from the following account given by Fleury from Gregory of Tours.

Chrodielde daughter of king Cherebert, was member of the monaſtery of the holy croſs in Poitiers, when Lebouere was abbeſs. In order to drive her from the place, and become abbeſs herſelf, ſhe engaged in her intereſt her couſin Baſire, daughter of king Chilperic, and left the monaſtery with forty other nuns, notwithſtanding the endeavours of biſhop Merowee to detain them. The complaint they made was that they were not treated as became the daughters of kings, but as ſlaves; and they likewiſe accuſed their abbeſs of ſeveral crimes. Having quitted the monaſtery, they travelled on foot in the month of February A. D. 589, and in very bad weather. They were, however, perſuaded to wait till the next ſummer at Tours, where they arrived the firſt of March. Then ap-

plying to king Gontram, he appointed an aſſembly of biſhops to judge of the affair. They not coming, Chrodielde and her companions returned to Poitiers, and aſſembling a company of robbers, and debauched people, fortified themſelves in the church of St. Hilary, and declared they would not return to the nunnery till the abbeſs was expelled. So far were they from paying any regard to the remonſtrances of the biſhops in the neighbourhood, who pronounced a ſentence of excommunication againſt them, that the banditti, entering the church in which they were aſſembled, knocked them down on the pavement, and broke the heads of ſome other clergymen who were preſent on the occaſion; ſo that they were obliged to fly as well as they could.

After this Chrodielde ſeized upon the lands of the monaſtery, threatening that if ſhe could get into the place, ſhe would throw the abbeſs over the wall. The rigour of the next winter obliged theſe rebellious nuns to ſeparate, when Chrodielde and Baſire quarrelled, the latter ſaying that ſhe was a princeſs as well as herſelf.

The year following, in A. D. 590, Chrodielde, always ſurrounded with her troop of banditti, ordered them to enter the monaſtery by night, and drag the abbeſs out. She, having the gout, could only get herſelf conveyed into the church, and thither

thither the banditti followed her with torches and arms; but some friends of the abbess extinguishing the torches, they could not find her. The next morning, however, they seized her, and put her in prison; and the night following they plundered the monastery, leaving nothing that they could carry away.

Being again threatened by the bishops, Chrodielde again assembled her banditti, and ordered them to kill the abbess, if any attempt should be made to rescue her by force. However, she was rescued, and took refuge in the church of St. Hilary. But the sedition continued, and some murders were committed even before the shrine of the holy cross.

At length, by the interference of the princes, these banditti were overpowered, and brought to punishment, some having their hands cut off, and others their noses. And the bishops being once more assembled on this occasion, all the complaints of Chrodielde and Basire were declared to be groundless. Yet when they were ordered to make their submission, and were threatened with excommunication till they should do it, they haughtily refused, and still threatened to kill the abbess. The bishops, therefore, pronounced the sentence of excommunication. This measure had, at length, the desired effect; for both these ladies made their

ſubmiſſion at the council of Metz, and obtained abſolution. This hiſtory will ſerve to give ſome idea of the diſorders of thoſe times, with reſpect to civil as well as religious matters.

Auſterity being now conſidered as eſſential to Chriſtian perfection, ſeveral perſons went far beyond the monks in this reſpect; and as a view of the extravagancies of the human mind has its uſe, I ſhall in this place relate ſome inſtances of it that occurred in this period; obſerving, however, that I do not vouch for the literal truth of every part of the narrative, tho' ſeemingly pretty well atteſted, conſidering that the accounts are from friends.

The moſt antient of theſe lovers of mortification that I ſhall mention is James the Syrian. He lived on a mountain, at a ſmall diſtance from the city of Cyr, well known by Theodoret having been biſhop of that place. He paſſed all his time in the open air, expoſed to all the inclemency of the weather, ſometimes burning in the ſun, and ſometimes found buried under the ſnow. Under his clothes he had heavy chains of iron. He did not make any uſe of fire, even to dreſs his victuals, which were only pulſe and water.

Another was Baradat, who after living ſome time in a hut, aſcended a rock, where he ſhut himſelf up in a kind of box, in which he could juſt ſtand upright, but expoſed to the weather. After

terwards he lived in the open air, with his hands continually ſtretched towards heaven, and ſo covered with a ſkin, that only his eyes and noſe were viſible.

But the moſt celebrated perſon in this way was Simeon, ſurnamed the *Stylite*, of whom a ſlight mention was made in the preceding part of this work, and who got that appellation from living on a pillar at a conſiderable diſtance from the ground. After living two years in one monaſtery, and ten in another, where he went beyond all his companions in his auſterities, eating only twice a week, and diſtinguiſhed by other mortifications, ſome of which are without the bounds of credibility, eſpecially his pretended faſt of forty days, in imitation of Moſes and Chriſt (which it is, however, ſaid that he repeated every year for twenty years together) he went to paſs his whole time upon a pillar, at firſt ſix feet high, eating only once a week, and not at all during lent. He had no covering but a ſkin, which reached to his feet. Here he was much reſorted to, and even by the emperors Marcian and Leo, and by the king of Perſia. Thus he lived thirty-ſix years on columns of different altitudes, the laſt of which was thirty-ſix cubits high, and died in A. D. 462, at the age of ſixty-nine.

After the death of this Simeon, who properly comes within the former period of this hiſtory, one Daniel undertook to follow his example. He was born near Samoſata, and at the age of twelve years retired to a neighbouring monaſtery. But accompanying his brother in a journey to Antioch, he ſaw Simeon on his pillar; and being permitted to go up to him, he received his benediction. On his death he fixed himſelf on a ſimilar pillar at Anaplus, near the mouth of the Euxine ſea. The ſituation of this place, ſubject to ſevere ſtorms of wind and rain, made his mode of life a harder diſcipline than that of his predeceſſor. One winter he was nearly carried away by the wind. It ſtripped him of his clothes, and he remained almoſt dead with cold. Notwithſtanding this, he lived in this manner to the age of eighty. In this ſituation he was ordained a prieſt by Gennadius patriarch of Conſtantinople, who went up to him on his pillar to give him the communion. The emperor Leo often viſited him, and ſhewed him great reſpect. He even built a monaſtery for his diſciples near to his pillar, and a place to receive thoſe who came to viſit him, and alſo an oratory in which to depoſit the remains of Simeon, which Daniel had got tranſlated from Antioch. Gubar, king of the Lazi, having come to renew his alliance with the Romans, the emperor took him to Daniel,

niel, as the moſt extraordinary perſon in his empire, when the king proſtrated himſelf with tears before the column, and the Stylite was made arbitrator of the terms of the treaty. This prince never afterwards ſent any meſſage to Conſtantinople, but he deſired the prayers of Daniel.

Near Egina in Cilicia there were two ſtylites, one a Catholic, and the other a Severian, and one Valſiliac lived upon a pillar for ſome time near Treves in Gaul; but ſo ſeverely did he ſuffer from the cold, that ſeveral times his nails fell off. At length, however, he was perſuaded by the biſhops of the neighbourhood to come down from his pillar, and live in a monaſtery with his diſciples below. This was the only example of *ſtylitiſm* in the Weſt.

Some monaſteries, however, in this period were ſufficiently ſevere in their diſcipline. The nuns of La Baumé in France were ſo ſtrictly confined, that they never went out but into the church yard; and tho' any of them had a ſon or a brother in the monaſtery at Lauconne, which was very near to them, they never ſaw them, nor heard any thing more of them than if they had been dead.

Aurelian, who founded a monaſtery at Arles in A. D. 548, ordered that his monks ſhould never go out of the monaſtery, or receive any laymen except in the parloir. Women they could never

ſee at all. They were not even allowed to ſpeak to one another in private. The eating of fleſh was forbidden, but fowls were allowed to the ſick, and fiſh to all on certain days. Here we firſt find, ſays Fleury, a diſtinction between the fleſh of fowls and groſſer meat.

SECTION V.

Of the ſtate of Heatheniſm, Judaiſm, and various Sects of Chriſtians in this Period.

THO' the emperors had now for a long time been Chriſtians, there were many remains of paganiſm within the bounds of the Roman empire, as appears by the laws and regulations that were made to ſuppreſs them. Cæſarius preaching againſt the vices of the times, A. D. 506, particularly enlarges on the obſervance of auguries, the honours paid to trees and fountains, and other remains of paganiſm. Theſe things were alſo forbidden by the fourth council of Orleans, A. D. 541. Alſo ſeveral pagan cuſtoms having been kept up on the Chriſtian feſtivals, which had been inſtituted to take place of them, they were forbidden by the council of Tours, A. D. 566, as they alſo were at the council of Toledo, A. D. 589.

The

The oppoſition which the Jews had made to the propagation of Chriſtianity was never forgotten or forgiven; and the Chriſtians now having the power, cruelly retaliated upon them, tho' there were ſome inſtances in which the Jews ſtill exerted what power they had in the perſecution of Chriſtians. In A. D. 522 Dunaan, a Jewiſh prince of the Homerites, cruelly perſecuted the Chriſtians in his dominions; and on taking the place, the inhabitants of which were all Chriſtians, he burned all the monks and nuns. But the year following he was attacked by Eleſbaan, a chriſtian king of Ethiopia, aſſiſted by the Greek emperor; when he was taken, and put to death, together with his principal relations. In A. D. 610, the Jews made a tumult at Antioch, and killed the patriarch Anaſtaſius.

But the ſeverities exerciſed upon the Jews were far more numerous than thoſe that were exerciſed by them, and both the Romans and the barbarian Chriſtians were equally hoſtile to them. The emperor Heraclius drove all the Jews from Jeruſalem, and ordered them not to approach within three miles of it. In A. D. 556 St. Ferreol drove from the city of Uzes, and all the dioceſe, the Jews who would not become Chriſtians. At the council of Toledo, A. D. 589, Jews were excluded from all public offices, forbidden to have

chriſtian ſlaves, or to marry chriſtian women. Siſebat, king of the Viſigoths in Spain, is ſaid to have converted all the Jews in his dominions, except ſuch as fled into France, which ſufficiently implies that force was uſed in their converſion. Ricared, another king in Spain, made an ordinance againſt the Jews; and being offered a great ſum by them, in order to obtain the repeal of it, he was commended for his refuſal of it by pope Gregory; and yet this Gregory forbad the uſe of force in the converſion of Jews. In Sicily, however, he promiſed them a diminution of the rent they paid to the ſee of Rome if they would become chriſtians. He acknowledged on this occaſion that theſe converſions might not be very ſincere; but he ſaid the children would by this means be baptized, and have a better diſpoſition. In France and other places, force was uſed in the converſion of the Jews, and they were baniſhed, if they refuſed to be baptized.

But little mention is made of *Unitarians* in the hiſtory of this period. But it is evident from the remarkable paſſage in Facundus, quoted by me in the *Hiſtory of early opinions concerning Chriſt*, vol. 3, p. 334, that they were numerous among the common people in the time of Juſtinian. They who were called *Bonoſians* were unitarians, and they

they exiſted in the time of pope Gregory. This pope, in giving directions in what manner to receive heretics, ſays that if they had been baptized in the name of the trinity, they ſhould be received without baptiſm, on their ſimple profeſſion of the Catholic faith; but that the *Bonoſians*, who did not believe that Jeſus Chriſt was God, muſt be rebaptized.* I have obſerved before that though the nations that invaded the Roman empire are generally ſtiled *Arians*, they were not univerſally ſo. For according to Gregory of Tours, Childebert king of France was a Photinian. And Chilperic wrote a treatiſe in defence of Saballianiſm, which he ſhewed to Gregory and the other biſhops, hoping to have their approbation of it; but not ſucceeding in this, he ſuppreſſed it. *Sueur*, A. D. 582

The Novatians were not yet wholly extinct. For Eulogius biſhop of Alexandria, who died A. D. 600, wrote againſt the Novatians and other heretics.

The Pelagian controverſy was never wholly dropped from the time of the Auſtin to the reformation.

* Bonoſus was biſhop of a church in Macedonia. He held the ſame ſentiments with Photinus; and his followers and thoſe of Photinus were numerous in Spain. Baronius ſays that between the Priſcillianiſts and the Arians the Catholics were a ſmall number, bearing no proportion to the heretics. *Robinson*, p. 213.

mation. The more rigid doctrines of Auſtin were always objected to by many perſons in Gaul, and a council of biſhops joined in the condemnation of them. At a council in Arles, one Lucidus, a prieſt, was obliged to retract them, particularly the following viz. that they who periſhed had not the power to ſave themſelves, that Chriſt did not die for all, and that God predeſtinated any perſon to damnation.

At the council of Orange, A. D. 528, it was decreed that the ſin of Adam affected all his poſterity, ſo that every thing that is good in man comes from the grace of God, and not from nature, but that all who are baptized can, and ought, by the cooperation of Jeſus Chriſt to accompliſh every thing that is neceſſary to his ſalvation, and that no perſon is predeſtinated to evil by God. Gennadius, a prieſt of Marſeilles, and a conſiderable writer, did not approve of the doctrine of Auſtin concerning grace. Fulgentius diſtinguiſhed between ſin and the puniſhment of it with reſpect to God; ſaying that it was the latter only that was predeſtinated, tho' the former was foreſeen.

Pelagianiſm flouriſhed much in Dalmatia, and Picenum in Italy, which was oppoſite to it. There an old man, of the name of Seneca, taught that there was no ſuch thing as original ſin, that infants dying unbaptized would not be damned, and that man

man by the uſe of his own free will might be ſaved. He ſaid that the clergy and monks might live with nuns, having nothing to fear if they lived innocently. This old man was brought before pope Gelaſius, but the arguments of his holineſs made no impreſſion upon him.

Notwithſtanding all the attempts that had been made by argumentation, and (what had unhappily been often had recourſe to) by force, the *Donatiſts* ſtill continued in Africa. Pope Gregory, writing to a biſhop of that country, complains that that ſect was much increaſed, and that they not only rebaptized many Catholics, but expelled biſhops from their ſees; ſo that this pope wrote to deſire that the laws might be enforced againſt them. However, the orders of the emperor Maurice to that purpoſe were ill executed. There were even of the clergy who ſuffered their children, or ſlaves, to be rebaptized by them.

Perſecution had alſo failed to exterminate the *Priſcillianiſts*. At a council of Braga, A. D. 563, decrees were made againſt the remainder of this ſect. One of the prieſts of Gregory of Tours denied the reſurrection, which proves that he had embraced their opinions. And by the permiſſion to abſtain from fleſh and wine, in the rules that Iſidore compoſed for the regulation of his monaſtery, it appears that there were Priſcillianiſts

at

at that time in the country, and that their prejudices were reſpected.

That *Eutychianiſm* was far from being ſuppreſſed by the council of Chalcedon, we have ſufficiently ſeen in a preceding ſection, and *Neſtorianiſm* was in ſome meaſure revived by thoſe who defended the *three chapters*, tho' it was peculiarly offenſive to the church at Conſtantinople. In order to vex the emperor Heraclius, Choſroes king of Perſia compelled all the Chriſtians in his dominions to embrace that ſect.

Beſides the continuance, or revival, of old ſects in this period, we find one new one, and what was peculiar to it, the founder, as he was called, of it had been long dead. This was that of the *Origeniſts*; the numerous writings of Origen continuing to be read, and admired by many, eſpecially among the monks, who had leiſure and a turn for ſpeculation. It was during the reign of Juſtinian that the controverſy on this ſubject broke out, the peculiar opinions of Origen being embraced by the monks of Paleſtine, at the head of whom was Nonnus. This doctrine ſpreading into many monaſteries, complaint was made of it to the emperor, who joined in the condemnation of it. It conſiſted of ſix heads, whether juſtly imputed to Origen or not, viz. "that the Father is "greater than the ſon, and the ſon than the holy "ſpirit;

"ſpirit; that God could create only a certain "number of ſpirits, and a certain quantity of "matter; that the ſouls of men preexiſted, and "were confined to bodies for a puniſhment; that "the ſun moon and ſtars are animated; that, at "the reſurrection, the human body will be of a "round figure; that future puniſhment will not "be eternal, and that even that of the dæmons "will have an end." The patriarch of Conſtantinople, and the pope, joined in the condemnation of theſe and ſome other errors, eſpecially that of "the preexiſtence of the ſoul of Jeſus Chriſt, "that his body was formed in the womb of the "virgin before its union with the logos, and that "in a future age Chriſt will be crucified for the "dæmons, as he has been for men."

Nonnus and his party were ſo much offended at this condemnation of the Origeniſts, that they ſeparated from the communion of the Catholics; and having induced the patriarch to acknowledge that anathemas not agreeable to God were null, they returned to their monaſteries. But retaining their zeal for their opinions, they preached publickly; and the controverſy between them and their opponents growing warm, they came to blows in the city of Jeruſalem, and in the monaſtery itſelf, on which occaſion one Theodulus, a Catholic, received

ceived a wound of which he died. In the end all theſe monks voluntarily or otherwiſe declared themſelves Origeniſts, and got poſſeſſion of all the monaſteries in the neighbourhood.

After the death of Nonnus the Originiſts were divided into two ſects. The chief of one of them was Iſidore, and Theodore of Cappadocia, who was powerful at court, was at the head of the other. Iſidor finding that he could not reſiſt the power of Theodore, joined himſelf to Conon abbot of the laure of Sabas.

While preparation was making for the council on the ſubject of the *three chapters*, and when the proper buſineſs of that council was concluded, the emperor, having been urged by the deputies of the patriarch of Jeruſalem, ſent to the biſhops an account of the errors of Origen, as maintained by the monks, in which he ſays, "We exhort you to aſ-"ſemble, and read carefully this account, and to "condemn each article of it, with the impious Ori-"gen, and all thoſe who ſhall be of the ſame ſen-"timent." The biſhops, obedient, as uſual, to the wiſhes of the emperor, unanimouſly condemned Origen and his followers. Theodore of Cæſaria would have prevented this condemnation, but he had loſt much of his credit, after the death of the empreſs Theodora. The monks of the new laura of St. Sabas, not approving of this condemnation

nation of Origen, ſeparated from the communion of the church, and in conſequence of it were baniſhed from the province.

Gregory, afterwards pope, being at Conſtantinople, had a diſpute with Eutychius, then reſtored to the church of Conſtantinople, who retaining ſome remains of Origeniſm, maintained that after the reſurrection, the body of Chriſt was impalpable. Theſe two prelates not being able to agree, Gregory refrained from communicating with Eutychius. On this the Emperor Tiberius ſummoned them before him, and thought of burning the book of Eutychius on the ſubject; but preſently after the patriarch died. However, as he declared in dying, that he expected to riſe again *in that fleſh*, it was ſuppoſed that he had changed his opinion.

SECTION VI.

Of the Progreſs of Chriſtianity in this Period.

CORRUPT as Chriſtianity was now become, it made ſome progreſs in this period, but not by the faireſt means. The apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians never addreſſed themſelves in the firſt inſtance to princes, but to thoſe perſons in the middle claſſes of life to whom they had the eaſieſt

acceſs, and on whom they thought their arguments were likely to have a good effect. But in this period, and ever after, the popes and emperors applied in the firſt inſtance to kings, and other perſons in power; and theſe being gained, fear or intereſt brought over thoſe who were ſubject to them.

Juſtinian perſuaded the king of the Heruli, and alſo a ſon of the king of the Huns, to embrace Chriſtianity; but the latter was put to death by his father for it. In one caſe the reſentment of the people againſt their king operated to produce the ſame effect. In A. D. 542, the Abages, a people inhabiting near mount Caucaſus, embraced Chriſtianity, becauſe their king uſed to take beautiful children from their parents, and make them eunuchs, in order to ſell them; and this practice was forbidden by Juſtinian.

The Axumites, an Ethiopian nation, alſo embraced the Chriſtian religion, on their conquering the Homerites in Arabia, whoſe king had put to death ſome Chriſtians who went thro' his country to trade in Ethiopia. After this their king ſent to Juſtinian for clergy to inſtruct the people; and he giving them the choice of a biſhop, they took John of the church of Alexandria. Naaman, an Arab chief, was converted to Chriſtianity

tianity about the year A. D. 593, but in what manner this was brought about is not ſaid.

The Sardinians were chiefly pagans in the time of pope Gregory. He ordered that if any peaſant belonging to the church ſhould not be converted he ſhould be taxed ſo high that he ſhould be compelled to it.

St. Amand procured orders from Dagobert king of the Franks to compel the people about Ghent to be baptized, which Fleury ſays was the firſt example of compulſory converſion with reſpect to the pagans, tho' it had been uſed with reſpect to the Jews, Vol. 8. p. 292. This Dagobert ordered all his ſubjects to be baptized, tho' pope Gregory had ſaid that all converſions ſhould be voluntary. St. Amand met with much difficulty in his undertaking, being inſulted by the women and peaſants.

The converſion of the Saxons in England being more intereſting to thoſe for whom this hiſtory is principally written, I ſhall dwell a little longer on the circumſtances of it. It is ſaid that Gregory, afterwards pope, ſeeing ſome handſome ſlaves expoſed to ſale at Rome, inquired of what country they were, and being informed that they were from England, he expreſſed his admiration of their perſons, as not *Angli*, but *angeli*, not Engliſh but angels, and alſo his concern that a na-

tion ſo well formed in body ſhould not have their minds enlightened with the knowledge of the goſpel, but remain under the power of the devil; and as ſoon as he had an opportunity, he ſent Auſtin the monk to attempt their converſion. This was in A. D. 595.

Auſtin and his companions, to the number of about forty, landed in the iſle of Thonet in A. D. 597, about a century after the arrival of the Saxons in Britain, when they were received by Bertha, the wife of Ethelbert king of Kent, and daughter of Cherebert king of France. She being a Chriſtian had ſtipulated for the free exerciſe of her religion, and accordingly had brought with her a biſhop of the name of Levidard. The king having received theſe miſſionaries in the open air, and allowed them to reſide in his capital city, which was Canterbury, they entered in a ſolemn proceſſion. By their ſtrict lives they ſoon converted many of the inhabitants, and at length the king himſelf, who gave them funds for the endowment of an epiſcopal church. Auſtin going to France was ordained biſhop of England at Arles, and returning to England baptized more than ten thouſand at the feſtival of Chriſtmas in A. D. 597. He then ſent to acquaint the pope with the ſucceſs of his miſſion.

In

In order to draw the Saxons to the chriſtian churches, Gregory adviſed Auſtin to make uſe of the heathen temples, and even their feſtivals; but inſtead of ſacrificing to demons, to kill the beaſts as uſual, and eat the fleſh in thanksgiving to God; that "by leaving them," as he ſaid, "theſe ſen-"ſible joys, he might more eaſily inſinuate into "their minds the joys of eternity." This, he ſaid, ſhould be done more particularly on the anniverſaries of the dedication of churches, and the feſtivals of the martyrs.

Auſtin found the antient Britons, who were Chriſtians, not at all diſpoſed to conform to the uſages of the church of Rome. They celebrated Eaſter on the 14th day of the moon, and they adminiſtered baptiſm in ſome different way. He had two ſolemn conferences with their biſhops on the ſubject, but he could not make any impreſſion upon them.

Auſtin not being able to prevail upon theſe antient Britiſh Chriſtians to acknowledge the ſupremacy of the church of Rome, and conform to its ritual, excited a cruel perſecution of them by means of the king of Northumberland, who was induced by the king of Kent to ſend an army into Wales; when the hiſtorian ſays that twelve hundred of them were crowned with martyrdom. *Sueur.* A. D. 600.

The converſion of the other Saxons in England was, in general, brought about in a manner ſimilar to this by Auſtin, the kings being gained in the firſt place, and frequently by means of their wives. Thus Edelburge, a daughter of the king of Kent, marrying the king of Northumberland, introduced the Chriſtian faith into that part of the country.

SECTION VII.

The Hiſtory of Perſecution in this Period.

IN the preceding periods of this Hiſtory we have ſeen the beginning of the accompliſhment of our Saviour's prediction, that he came *not to ſend peace on the earth, but a ſword.* After the ceſſation of pagan perſecution by the emperors becoming Chriſtians, it was reſumed by the Chriſtians themſelves in the time of Conſtantine. It has continued with more or leſs violence to this day, and will continue till the complete downfall of Antichriſt, or that power, temporal or ſpiritual, which is contrary to that *kingdom of peace and righteouſneſs*, which will be finally eſtabliſhed by the univerſal prevalence of the genuine goſpel of Chriſt.

The

The ſevere edicts of Conſtantine and Theodoſius being continued, the particulars under this head that deſerve to be recited, as *new*, are not many. The emperor Leo ordered that no perſon ſhould act as an advocate in any tribunal, but a Catholic. Pope Gelaſius baniſhed ſome Manicheans from Rome. Juſtinian took from the heretics all their churches, and gave them to the Catholics, in the third year of his reign. He alſo confiſcated their property, as he did that of the pagans, allowing them three months for their converſion. The churches of the Arians were very rich, and many poor perſons, even of the Catholics, were maintained out of them. On this ſeveral, out of deſpair, put an end to their lives, and ſome Montaniſts, ſhutting themſelves up in their churches, and ſetting fire to them, burned themſelves along with them. The ſeverity of this emperor to the Samaritans made them revolt, and commit ſeveral outrages; but they were ſubdued with great ſlaughter.

Pope Hormiſdas, who died A. D. 523, whipped, and baniſhed, the Manicheans. At the ſame time the emperor Juſtin ordered that they ſhould be baniſhed, and puniſhed with death. He took from the pagans, the Jews, and all heretics, every public employment, excepting only the Goths, for fear of offending Theodoric. At the ſame time

they met with much worſe treatment from Cavades king of Perſia. He firſt made them believe that he would encourage their doctrine, and having aſſembled them, and their biſhops, he ordered them all to be put to death.

SECTION VIII.

Of the ſtate of Superſtition in this Period.

THAT ſuperſtition ſhould be found among Chriſtians, eſpecially in this period, is not to be wondered at, when we conſider that it is univerſally the offspring of ignorance; and tho' the light of revelation tended to baniſh it from both Judaiſm and Chriſtianity, its principles were not always ſufficiently attended to. Events in which men are much intereſted they will always be apt to aſcribe to wrong cauſes, and it is in this that the eſſence of ſuperſtition conſiſts.

From habits of long continuance, a prejudice even for heathen cuſtoms remained a long time among Chriſtians. In the time of pope Gelaſius the ſenator Andromachus, and others, wanted to reſtore the *Lupercalia*, one of the moſt extravagant and indecent of all the heathen ceremonies; imagining the omiſſion of this feſtival to have been the

the cauſe of a public malady with which the city of Rome had been afflicted. But the pope addreſſed a letter to them on the ſubject, and ſo far was he from being of the ſame opinion with them, that, with equal ſuperſtition, he aſcribed the fall of the empire to the Chriſtian emperors not having aboliſhed thoſe things before.

The privileges of ſanctuaries were introduced from heatheniſm into Chriſtianity; but as yet this abuſe was very moderate. The emperor Leo ordered that no perſon ſhould be taken from a church, or have any claim on the biſhop or the clergy for the debts of perſons who took refuge in them, as had been ordered by Arcadius. They were anſwerable, however, to their creditors, and effects depoſited in the churches were to be given up.

Divination by lots was a common heathen practice, and this alſo was copied by Chriſtians. And with them the favourite mode of prying into futurity was by opening a Bible at random, and reading the firſt paſſage that preſented itſelf, as applicable to the circumſtances in which they were. This mode of ſuperſtition was forbidden by the council of Agde in A. D. 506; but this was far from putting a ſtop to the practice. When the emperor Heraclius marched againſt the Perſians, in A. D. 622, he took in his hand an image of ſome ſaint, ſaid not to have been made by human

hands, and ſwore to his troops to fight even to death; and returning from his victory he caſt lots by the ſcriptures about the place where he ſhould paſs the winter.

The ordeal, eſpecially that by fire, was ſometimes uſed by Chriſtians. At the council of Saragoſſa in Spain, when Arianiſm was ſuppreſſed in that country, it was ordered that the relics which had belonged to Arians ſhould be tried by fire, on the idea that true relics could not be burned. What was the iſſue of this trial we are not told. It ſhould have been extended to all relics alike.

The greateſt and beſt men of this age did not eſcape the ſuperſtitious veneration for relics. The empreſs Conſtantina, having written to pope Gregory for ſome part of the body of St. Paul, in order to its being depoſited in a church erected to his honour, the pope wrote in anſwer, that the bodies of the apoſtles were ſo dreadful for their miracles, that no perſon durſt approach them, that ſeveral perſons only digging near them had been terrified by apparitions, &c. and that their cuſtom was to lay pieces of linen cloth near their bodies, and then enſhrine them, and that theſe had the ſame virtue with the bodies of the ſaints themſelves.

S. Eligius, or Eloi, biſhop of Noyon was famous for the diſcovery of the bodies of ſaints. It was he who found thoſe of St. Quintin, St. Plato,

Plato, St. Criſpin, St. Criſpinian, St. Lucian, and many others. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 21.

Having found prejudices in favour of antient heathen cuſtoms among Chriſtians, we ſhall leſs wonder at finding ſome in favour of Jewiſh ones, eſpecially in transferring the ſabbath from ſaturday to ſunday. This was the leſs extraordinary, as both theſe days having been uſed for the purpoſe of public worſhip, it was not unnatural to give them the ſame uſes in all reſpects. Conſtantine, however, who made the firſt ordinance on the ſubject, made the proper diſtinction between them, allowing the labours of huſbandry on ſundays. But theſe were forbidden by the third council of Orleans in A. D. 538. Childebert alſo forbad all labour on that day, except what was neceſſary to procure ſubſiſtence. At the council of Macon, in A. D. 585, it was forbidden to fight on ſundays, this being claſſed among works of labour. It would have been happy for the Chriſtian world, if this ordinance had been obſerved. Some perſons obſerving both ſaturday and ſunday as days of reſt, pope Gregory reproved the ſuperſtition of thoſe who obſerved the former, at the ſame time that he enjoined reſt from all labour on the latter.

Of ſuperſtition with reſpect to baptiſm we have ſeen a great deal in former periods of this hiſtory. A curious caſe relating to it occurs in this. A per-

ſon

ſon having made profeſſion of the Chriſtian faith, ſo as to be prepared for baptiſm, having been rendered incapable of making the proper reſponſes at the time, by a diſeaſe of which he died preſently after, and another perſon making the reſponſes for him, as for infants, a queſtion aroſe whether his baptiſm would avail for his ſalvation. Ferrand of Carthage thought it would not, ſince he had actual ſin, tho' it would ſuffice in the caſe of infants, who had only original ſin. "Beſides, is it not an in-"jury," ſaid he, "to children if they die after "they have been baptized, but before they have "received the Lord's ſupper." Fulgentius, however, maintained that, as this man was converted, having really changed his opinion before his illneſs, he was ſafe, and that they who are baptized begin in reality from that time to feed on the body and blood of Chriſt, even without receiving the outward elements; an idea which gradually led the church to omit the communion of infants, eſpecially as the idea of the ſanctity of the elements was advanced, and infants were liable to receive them in what was thought to be an irreverent manner.

That bread actually conſecrated for the purpoſe of communion ſhould be regarded with ſuperſtitious reſpect we do not wonder at. But that which had only been preſented at the time, tho'

not

not conſecrated, was conſidered as ſomething *ſacred*, and the partaking of it a kind of communion. Theſe loaves were called *eulogies*. King Merovæus demanding thoſe eulogies was for ſome time refuſed by Gregory of Tours, till he remonſtrated that he ought not to be ſuſpended from communion, but by the conſent of the other biſhops.

As it was thought to be wrong to waſh immediately after baptiſm, or to eat before communion, it was alſo thought to be improper to bathe preſently after communion. Theodore Siceota reproved thoſe who did it; ſaying that they who were perfumed did not bathe, leſt they ſhould loſe the grateful odour of the perfumes.

It had been well if ſuperſtition among Chriſtians had ended with the mere folly of it; but it has generally been the ſubſtitute for ſubſtantial virtue. In the delineation of a good Chriſtian by Eligius, or Eloi, above mentioned, nothing is ſaid of the love of God, reſignation to his will, obedience to his laws, or of juſtice, benevolence, or charity towards men; but the whole of religion is made to conſiſt in going often to the church, bringing offerings to the altar, lighting candles in conſecrated places, and ſuch like vain ſervices. *Moſheim* Vol 2. p. 22.

Even in this early period the obligation of an oath was thought capable of being diſſolved by the

the authority of a Chriſtian prieſt. The army of the emperor Maurice having revolted, and bound themſelves by an oath that they would no more obey his general Philippicus, Gregory, biſhop of Antioch, who had perſuaded them to return to their obedience, told them that, by the power which he had from Chriſt, to *bind and to looſe*, he could abſolve them from their oath, and this ſatisfied them. We ſhall ſee more inſtances of this flagrant violation of morality hereafter.

The progreſs of vice generally keeps pace with that of ſuperſtition; and as this was an age in which the barbarous nations made the greateſt irruptions into the Roman empire, we cannot wonder at the many accounts of rapine and violence that we meet with. The deſolation of Italy by Chriſtian invaders in the time of pope Gregory was dreadful. In the anarchy of ten years, which took place in Italy after the death of the Lombard king Clephis, the churches were ſtripped, the biſhops murdered, cities ruined, and the people exterminated. In the hiſtory of Gregory of Tours there are many examples of biſhops and prieſts dragged from their churches, loaded with chains, beaten and inſulted various ways. In the civil wars in France, A. D. 573, the churches ſuffered more ſays Gregory of Tours, than in the perſecution of Dioclefian. Theodebert ſon of Chilperic laid waſte the Limouſin,

fin, and le Quercé, burning churches, ſeizing ſacred veſſels, killing the clergy, driving away the monks, and raviſhing the nuns.

Another conſequence of the diſorders of thoſe times was the injury that was done to eccleſiaſtical diſcipline. Many of the clergy adopted the licentious manners of the ſecular princes. The biſhops became too much addicted to the pleaſures of the world, when the empire became Chriſtian, and for the purpoſes of ambition they had gone to Conſtantinople more than the duty of their office admitted. On this account Juſtinian thought it neceſſary to forbid their going thither without leave. By another ordinance of Juſtinian, in A. D. 541, the clergy were forbidden to play at dice, even to look on while others played, or to be preſent at any public ſpectacle, under the penalty of three years ſuſpenſion. At the council of Epaone, in A. D. 517, the clergy were forbidden to keep hounds or hawks. At the council of Macon, in A. D. 585, biſhops were alſo forbidden the ſame things. At a council of Chalons in A. D. 579, two biſhops, Salonicus and Sagittarius, were depoſed, and among other enormities it appeared that they fought in perſon, and killed people with their own hands. At a council of Macon in A. D. 583, biſhops were forbidden to bear arms.

With

With ſo many incentives to ambition, we do not wonder at the factious diſpoſition of ſo many biſhops of this period. Egidius, biſhop of Rheims, at the council of Metz in A. D. 590, charged with conſpiring againſt the life of king Childebert, at length confeſſed that he had always acted againſt the intereſt of the king and his mother, and that it was by his advice that the wars which had been the cauſe of the ravages in Gaul had taken place. In conſequence of this, he was depoſed, and baniſhed to Straſburgh. So general was the ſuſpicion of the ſuperior clergy living diſorderly lives, that at a council held A. D. 503, on occaſion of the pope Symmachus being charged with adultery, or ſome other heinous crime, it was ordered that all biſhops, prieſts and deacons, ſhould have perſons of approved virtue to live with them, and be witneſſes of their conduct. Theſe guardians of the virtue of the clergy were called *Syncelli*.

Biſhoprics being of ſo much value in a temporal reſpect, and giving men ſo much power, we cannot wonder at improper methods being uſed to get them. It is obſerved by Fleury, under the year A. D. 534, that in France a cuſtom was introduced of the kings ſelling biſhoprics. At the council of Clemont in A. D. 535, an attempt was made to put a ſtop to this abuſe, by ordering that all biſhops ſhould be choſen by the clergy and people;

people; and that if any perſon obtained a benefice by means of caballing at court, he ſhould be deprived of communion with that church. By a law of Juſtinian ſimony was ſo ſtrictly forbidden and guarded againſt, that Fleury obſerves it muſt have been very common. Vol. 7. p. 338.

The intereſt which the founders of churches had in appointing the clergy to officiate in them was, of courſe, very great, and this was a motive with wealthy perſons to build and endow churches. But in A. D. 538 the emperor Juſtinian made a conſtitution, by which the founders of churches were prohibited from appointing the clergy to ſerve them. They could only preſent them to the biſhop of the dioceſe. Here, as Fleury obſerves, we ſee the origin of patronage. Vol. 7. p. 371.

SECTION IX.

Of the Power of the Popes in this Period.

WE have ſeen the great extenſion of the authority of the biſhops of Rome in conſequence of the law of Valentinian Vol. 2. p. 545. During the ſubſequent troubles of Italy, in which the influence of the popes was of particular con-

ſequence to the emperors reſiding in the Eaſt, their power kept gradually extending itſelf, tho' in this period it was far ſhort of what it came to be afterwards. What is moſt aſtoniſhing to a perſon acquainted with the preceding hiſtory, is the impudence of the claims of the popes of this period. But the times were favourable to them, and not to any rigorous inquiry into the foundation of their pretenſions.

Pope Gelaſius aſſerted the authority of the popes to receive appeals in all caſes of hereſy. "The canons," he ſays, "have ordered that all "appeals be made to the ſee of Rome, and that "there be no appeal from it." With reſpect to Eutychianiſm, about which he was writing, he ſays, "Timothy of Alexandria, and Peter of An- "tioch, were depoſed by the ſole authority of the "apoſtolic ſee, and Acacius himſelf is witneſs of "it, ſeeing he was the executor of their judgment; "ſo that he himſelf was condemned in the ſame "manner when he joined in communion with "them." Writing to the biſhops of Dardania, A. D. 495, he ſays, "It belongs to the apoſtolic "ſee to confirm the acts of councils by their au- "thority. All acknowledge," he ſays, "now that the "ſee of St. Peter has a right to abſolve from the judg- "ment of all the biſhops, and to judge the whole "church, without any perſon having a right to "arraign

"arraign their deciſion, ſince" as he obſerved before, "the canons order that appeals may be made "to that ſee from all the world, and no appeals "from it." Now the only authority for this was a council held at Rome in A. D. 378, conſiſting of national biſhops, in which they thank the emperors Gratian, and Valentinian, for the authority they had given to the ſee of Rome. But this was far from being a general council, admitting the decrees of ſuch a council to bind the whole Chriſtian church.

However, in a ſynod held at Rome in A. D. 494, conſiſting of ſixty-ſix biſhops, this pope declared that the church of Rome is to be preferred to all other churches, not by the conſtitution of councils, but by the voice of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, when he ſaid to Peter *Upon this rock will I build my church*, which places the authority of the popes on a foundation quite different from that of the councils. *Sæur.* A. D. 494.

The ſame pope, writing to the emperor Anaſtaſius, ſays, "There are two methods by which "the world is governed, the ſacred authority of "the biſhops, and the royal power. The office "of the biſhops is the greater, becauſe they are "to give an account to God, even of kings. For "tho'," he adds, "your dignity raiſes you above "the reſt of mankind, you bow to the prelates,

" you receive the ſacraments at their hands, and " follow their judgment in matters of religion. " And if the faithful in general ought to be ſub- " ject to the biſhops, how much more ought they " to be ſubject to the biſhop of that ſee which God " has eſtabliſhed above all the biſhops, and which " has always been acknowledged as ſuch by the " whole church."

The government of the church having by this time been pretty well eſtabliſhed, by which biſhops and metropolitans had a certain juriſdiction, the popes did not directly make any innovations in that. In the time of pope Gregory, Fleury ſays, the pope had a proper juriſdiction over the ſees that were termed *ſuburbican*, over which he was the regular metropolitan, that is, over the ſouthern parts of Italy, where he was the ſole archbiſhop; alſo over Sicily and the other iſlands, tho' they had their reſpective metropolitans. But he did not exerciſe the ſame power in the provinces immediately dependant on the ſees of Milan, and Aquileia, or in Spain and Gaul, tho' he had his vicars in Gaul, and in Illyricum. * He alſo extended his care to the churches in Africa, ſo far as to

* The biſhops of Milan were never ordained by thoſe of Rome, but by the biſhop of Aquileia. *Bingham* Vol. 1. p. 347.

to direct councils to be held, and see that the canons were observed. He had no jurisdiction at all over any of the churches in the East, and took no notice of their conduct, except on extraordinary occasions.

But tho' the authority of the popes was in some measure limited in those provinces in which the Christian religion had been long established, and in which a certain discipline had prevailed, it was unbounded in those countries in which it was then first received. On the mission of Austin to England, Gregory, by his own authority, appointed what bishoprics should be created, and the manner in which they should be subordinate to one another.

Of the abject submission to the popes by those whose interest led them to yield it, we have too many instances in this period of our history. The bishops of Dardania, writing to pope Gelasius, call him the *father of fathers*, and say that they will obey his orders in every thing; and that as soon as they received them, they renounced the heresy of Eutyches, of Acacius, and his followers.

Ennodius said of pope Symmachus, that he was constituted judge in the place of God, which he filled as vicegerent of the most high. *Mosheim*, Vol. I. p. 443. In one of his works he even maintained that all who were raised to the dignity of

pope, either were then ſaints, or became ſo; that men may judge other men, but that the judgment of the pope was reſerved for God only; ſince Jeſus ſaid to Peter only, *Thou art Peter.*

It was from the emperors of the Eaſt that the popes borrowed their extravagantly high titles. Under Theodoſius the younger it became cuſtomary to aſcribe to the Chriſtian emperors the titles of *divinity*. This emperor and Valentinian gave each other the title of *eternally auguſt*. Then the biſhops, and among the reſt thoſe of Rome, and the councils, gave them theſe titles. They often called Marcian *moſt divine emperor*, *moſt divine Auguſtus*, and *eternally Auguſt*. Every thing that came from them was termed *ſacred*, *celeſtial* and *divine*. Then they were called *adorable*, and *for ever adorable*; and in addreſſing them they ſaid that they laid themſelves at their feet, and when they came into their preſence they kiſſed their feet. When the emperors were driven out of Rome, and the biſhops became maſters of it, they claimed the ſame honours. *Sueur.* A. D. 549. 550.

Even the Arian princes found it their intereſt to favour and extend the authority of the popes, ſo much did they ſee it to be in their power, by means of the influence they had with other biſhops, and the people at large, to diſturb their government. In A. D. 528 Athalaric king of the Goths in Italy, ordered

ordered that no action ſhould be brought againſt any of the clergy of Rome before the cauſe had been carried to the pope.

The churches of Africa in this period ſhewed an implicit deference to the authority of that of Rome. It was conſulted with reſpect to the treatment of thoſe who yielded to perſecution in the time of the Vandal princes. A ſynod was called on this occaſion by Felix biſhop of Rome. It conſiſted of thirty-eight biſhops, when various decrees were made reſpecting the different caſes, as of clergy and laity, &c. and in this deciſion the churches of Africa acquieſced. *Sueur.* A. D. 487.

There are examples even in Eaſtern churches of extraordinary power being allowed to the biſhops of Rome. Pope Gregory abſolved John of Chalcedon of hereſy, tho' condemned by the judges appointed by the patriarch of Conſtantinople; and the patriarch made no oppoſition to it.

When other biſhops, however, made any pretenſions which tended to exalt them over their brethren, none were ſo ready to repreſs that aſpiring ſpirit as the popes. This was remarkably the caſe with Gregory with reſpect to the title of *œcumenical*, or *univerſal, biſhop*, which had been given by way of compliment to ſeveral patriarchs, as to Dioſcorus of Alexandria, (*Sueur.* A. D. 595.) and was firſt aſſumed by John the patriarch of Conſtanti-

nople. On this occaſion Gregory wrote to him to reprove him for it, as a thing that "ſcandalized all "his brethren." A title, he ſays, "full of extra-"vagance and pride, and that tho' the ſame title had "been offered to the biſhops of Rome at the coun-"cil of Chalcedon, it was rejected by them." He alſo wrote to the empreſs, and to the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria on the ſame ſubject. All theſe letters are dated A. D. 595. Farther to reprove the arrogance of this patriarch, Gregory aſſumed the title of *ſervus ſervorum Dei*, the *ſervant of the ſervants of God*, which has been retained by the popes to this day. *Giannone*, Vol. I. p. 225.

This John, tho' ſeemingly ſo ambitious, was ſo exemplary for his mortifications (which was the great teſt of virtue in this age) that he obtained the ſurname of *the Faſter*. Notwithſtanding the remonſtrances of Gregory, John would not give up his title, nor would his ſucceſſor Cyriacus, which added to the reſentment of Gregory. He did not, however, break communion with him on this account, but he exhorted him to renounce ſo profane a title.

Afterwards he ſeems to have reſented it ſtill more. For when he ſent his nuncio to Conſtantinople, he ordered him not to communicate with the patriarch, unleſs he would renounce that title, and he gave his reaſons for this to the emperor and

to

to the biſhops of Alexandria and Antioch. They adviſed him not to cauſe a ſcandal for a thing of nothing; but the pope would not yield; ſaying the aſſumption of this title by the patriarch of Conſtantinople would tend to corrupt the faith of the whole church; ſince ſeveral of the biſhops of Conſtantinople had been heretics. He even added that, whoever ſhould aſſume that title of *univerſal biſhop*, was the forerunner of Antichriſt, by placing himſelf above others. In order, probably, to depreſs the ſee of Conſtantinople, he maintained that Peter, the prince of the apoſtles, had his church in three places, the chief at Rome, where he died, another at Alexandria, whither he ſent Mark the evangeliſt, and the third at Antioch, where he lived ſeven years.

As good a man as pope Gregory appears to have been, theſe pretenſions of the biſhop of Conſtantinople, which interfered with his own dignity, were much upon his mind, and he omitted no opportunity of proteſting againſt them. A council being about to be held at Conſtantinople, he wrote to the Oriental biſhops to warn them not to conſent to the title of univerſal biſhop being given to the patriarch of Conſtantinople, on that occaſion, and in general to guard againſt any incroachment on the rights of other churches.

This pope seems not a little inconsistent with himself when he thought it necessary to express his humility as a Christian, at the same time that he would abate nothing of his pretensions as bishop of the Apostolic see. He even reproved the bishop of Alexandria for using, in a letter to him, the expression *as you ordered me*; saying that he was "his "brother by his rank, and his father by his virtue." "Let us," says he, "forbear expressions which puff "up vanity, and hurt charity." On another occasion he says, "All bishops are subject to the po- "pal see when they commit faults, tho' all are "equal according to the law of humility. No "one doubts" he says, "but that the church of "Constantinople is subject to the holy see, as the "emperor and the bishops of that city declare con- "tinually."

This very same title, however, which gave so much offence to pope Gregory, when assumed by the bishops of Constantinople, was sought after, and accepted, by pope Boniface, when it was given him by the emperor Phocas; who being an usurper, might think it necessary to secure the favour of the pope. He also wished by this means to mortify Cyriacus the patriarch of Constantinople, with whom he was at variance. *Giannone*, Vol. I. p. 225. The Catholics pretend that nothing was then meant by this title besides that just superiority

ty to which the church of Rome was intitled above that of Conſtantinople. But why then did Gregory reject it; and condemn it univerſally?

The biſhops of Conſtantinople diſcovered as much ambition as thoſe of Rome, but circumſtances were not ſo favourable to them. After the emperors became Chriſtian, and reſided in that city, the biſhops began to extend their authority; firſt emancipating themſelves from the juriſdiction of the biſhops of Heraclea, to which the church of Byzantium was originally ſubject. They then extended their authority in Aſia, Pontus, and Thrace, and then over the three original patriarchs of Jeruſalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. *Giannone* Vol. I. p. 168. In the time of Leo Iſauricus the patriarch of Conſtantinople claimed the juriſdiction of Illyricum, Epirus, Achaia, and Macedonia, and alſo of Sicily, and many parts of Magna Græcia. Ib. p. 171.

Such was the ſituation of the biſhops of Rome at this period, that much buſineſs of a civil nature was devolved upon them. Gregory complains of this in a feeling manner. Writing to a friend on his election he ſays, "There is ſo much of temporal buſineſs in this dignity that I find myſelf almoſt ſeparated by it from the love of God. I have more temporal concerns than when I was a layman." Writing to Leander in Spain, he

ſays,

ſays, that "he was continually plunged in low "thoughts, ſo that he could hardly have a moment "for contemplation, being obliged to apply to ter-"reſtrial things."

At this time the popes were by no means temporal princes, yet the urgency of the times led them ſometimes to act as ſuch. Thus, thro' the negligence of the Exarch, pope Gregory appointed a commander to act againſt the Lombards. The great wealth of the biſhops of Rome contributed much to their power. When Traſimond king of the Vandals in Africa baniſhed two hundred and twenty biſhops pope Symmachus cauſed all of them to be furniſhed with every thing neceſſary to their ſubſiſtence. *Giannone* Vol. I. p. 183.

The power of the popes being ſo great in this period, we cannot wonder at the eager conteſts there ſometimes were for that dignity. In the ſchiſm between Symmachus and Laurentius, A. D. 501, there was much violence, and many murders committed, and among the reſt ſeveral prieſts loſt their lives.

The popes, like other biſhops, were originally choſen by the clergy and the people jointly; but the votes of the people were gradually excluded, and at length thoſe of the ordinary clergy. In a council held by pope Symmachus, A. D. 499, it was ordained that when any pope died before any pro-

provision could be made for a successor, he should be appointed who had the majority in the votes of the clergy.

SECTION X.

Some Particulars relating to the Clergy, Churches, &c. in this Period, and other Articles of a miscellaneous Nature.

THE state of the clergy in this period was not materially different from what it was in the former. But the following circumstances of a miscellaneous nature deserve to be noticed.

1. There was no place of clerical education, besides the churches and the houses of the bishops, who directed the studies of particular persons. This was the more easy, as profane science was not thought necessary to the functions of the clergy. There were, however, larger schools for catechumens in some places, especially that at Alexandria, where Origen had taught; but these were not for the use of the clergy as such. All the knowledge required of them was that of the scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, and the canons of the church, which in time came to be an intricate but lucrative study, like that of the civil law. Pope Gregory

gory forbad even the teaching of Grammar, because in the Grammar ſchools uſe was made of profane authors, at the hazard of teaching idolatry. This apprehenſion, tho' well founded, is thought to have contributed to the extinction of liberal knowledge in general among the Romans.

2. Biſhops were always choſen from the inferior clergy belonging to the ſee, and by the people; the metropolitan and the neighbouring biſhops giving their approbation by ordaining him. It was only in the greater ſees, after the emperors became Chriſtian, that they interfered in the choice of biſhops, The prieſts always performed the duty of the biſhop in his abſence or illneſs, and this ſeems to have been arranged among themſelves. But pope Gregory appointed that, in caſe of the ſickneſs or incapacity of the biſhop, a particular perſon ſhould be fixed upon to do his duty, with a view to ſucceed him, and this was the origin of *coadjutors* in the Catholic church.

3. The habit of the clergy began to be diſtinguiſhed from that of the laity at the time of the irruption of the Barbarians into the Roman empire, the clergy keeping to the Roman dreſs, which conſiſted of a large flowing garment, very different from the cloſe dreſs of the northern nations.

At

At the council of Narbonne in A. D. 589 the uſe of the ſurplice was enjoined, but only during divine ſervice.

4. Cardinal biſhops, prieſts, and deacons in the time of pope Gregory were, according to Fleury, thoſe who were attached to particular churches, diſtinguiſhed from thoſe who ſerved them only by commiſſion. Vol. 8, p. 36. Giannone ſays they were ſtrangers in the churches in which they were appointed to officiate, ſaid to be *incardinate* into them, or depending upon them as the door upon their hinges, whence the term. They had not, he ſays, any peculiar dignity or ſuperiority. Vol. 1, p. 232. But Sueur ſays the term *cardinal* ſeems to have been uſed in different ſenſes by antient writers, many of them for the *principal*, agreeable to the uſe of the word on other occaſions, as the *cardinal points* in the heavens, the *cardinal virtues*, *&c.* Thus the church in which baptiſm was adminiſtered was called the cardinal or principal church; and the clergy who officiated in it the cardinal clergy. A. D. 964.

5. It appears that at Alexandria there were of the clergy who were both married and artiſans, for mention is made of one who maintained himſelf, and many relations, by his labour.

Juſtinian was the firſt emperor who enlarged the cogniſance of the biſhops in eccleſieſtical cauſes,

es, and granted them the privilege of not pleading before lay judges, and that civil actions of the clergy and monks ſhould be decided by the biſhops. But they had not as yet any priſons, nor could they inflict corporal puniſhment, or impoſe a fine. *Giannone*, Vol. I. p. 181.

6. By an ordinance of Juſtinian in A. D. 471, biſhops, before their conſecration, were to recite their formulary for communion, for baptiſm, and other ſolemn prayers; from which it may be inferred, that tho' thoſe forms might be precompoſed, they made no uſe of books for that purpoſe, but repeated *memoriter*, if they were not capable of officiating ex-tempore.

7. It is evident from the New Teſtament that in the primitive times there was no precompoſed form for public worſhip among Chriſtians, tho' there probably was among the Jews. They met to read the ſcriptures, ſing pſalms, adminiſter the Lord's ſupper, and exhort the people as there was occaſion. As our Lord *gave thanks* at the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, this was gradually extended to a conſiderable length. It is probable there was much uniformity in the ſubject of it, but every biſhop acquitted himſelf in this reſpect as he was able, (ως εδυνατο) as Juſtin Martyr ſays. Some perſons, however, being, in proceſs of time, leſs qualified to do this to the ſatisfaction of the aſſembly,

assembly, forms were gradually introduced; but they were different in different places. In this period pope Gelasius composed one for the use of the church of Rome; and he is the first who is said to have done this.

But the person to whom the church of Rome is still more indebted in this respect was pope Gregory. In A. D. 599 he reformed the offices of this church, adding to what had been done by Gelasius, and altering many things. At the same time all the other great churches had their own offices, and not only those in Greece, and the East, but the Latin churches in Africa, Spain, Gaul and Milan. Gregory also regulated the singing, and established a school for teaching it. Austin, when he went to Britain, took persons from this school, who instructed also the Gauls in psalmody.

8. At the council of Braga in A. D. 562, bishops were forbidden to use the form *pax vobiscum, peace be with you,* in blessing the people, but to say *nobiscum, peace be with us,* which was required of priests. But notwithstanding this the distinction prevailed, and is still kept up in the church of England.

9. One bishop having been originally appointed for one city or district, when there was only one congregation of Christians in it, the same continued to be the case after they became numerous, and were therefore obliged to meet in se-

parate places. In this caſe the biſhop preſerved his ſuperiority over the whole, and the inferior clergy officiated in the ſubordinate ones. This accounts for the great number of prieſts and deacons in ſuch churches as thoſe of Rome, Conſtantinople, and Alexandria. By a law of Juſtinian the great church at Conſtantinople was to have ſixty prieſts, one hundred deacons, forty deaconeſſes, eighty ſubdeans, and twenty-five chanters; ſo that all the clergy were four hundred and twenty-five, and one hundred porters. Theſe, however, ſerved ten other churches united to the cathedral.

10. At the council of Macon in A. D. 585, *tithes* were ordered to be paid to the miniſters of the church, under pain of excommunication. This, ſays Fleury, is the firſt mention that is made of tithes. Vol. 7. p. 526.

11. The firſt inſtance of a *general confeſſion*, Fleury ſays, was made in this period by St. Eloi, who confeſſed all his ſins from his youth to a prieſt, and impoſed upon himſelf a ſevere penance. Vol. 8. p. 294.

The ignorant clergy of this period received very ſeaſonable aſſiſtance in the diſcharge of their duty by the *Penitential* of Theodore, who, from being a Grecian monk, was advanced to the ſee of Canterbury. It contains the definition of all ſins, and the

the proper penances to be appointed for them, with the forms of abſolution and exhortation. This work was univerſally received in all the Weſtern churches; but in the eighth century this diſcipline, which was agreeable to the antient canons of the church, grew into diſuſe, being ſupplanted by the new canon of *indulgences*. *Moſheim* Vol. 2. p. 25.

In A. D. 509 at Epone in France a council ordered that no altars ſhould be conſecrated but ſuch as were made of ſtone. Before this they were in the form of tables; but now they had that of an altar, ſupported either on one foot, or a pillar, or erected like a tomb. *Bingham* p. 302.

In the council of Agde in A. D. 506 is the firſt diſtinct account of the conſecration of altars, where the ceremony of chriſm was added to that of ſacerdotal benediction. Ib. p. 328.

12. Mention is made of four altars in the church of Saintes in this period. But Fleury ſays we are not to conclude that they were all uſed at the ſame time. Vol. 8. p. 103.

It was firſt determined in the council of Agde, in A. D. 566, that all Chriſtians ſhould communicate at the three great feſtivals, under the penalty of not being conſidered as Catholics. At the council of Lateran, under Innocent III, it was made neceſſary only at Eaſter. *Bingham* p. 829.

In the time of pope Gregory there were no private maſſes, or maſſes without communicants, which were in after times recited for particular purpoſes, as the delivery of perſons from purgatory. And all who aſſiſted at the ſervice partook of the Lord's ſupper. *Sueur* A. D. 600.

13. At the council of Braga in A. D. 563, it was forbidden to bury the dead in churches.

14. In A. D. 607 the Pantheon at Rome was converted into a Chriſtian church, dedicated to the virgin Mary, and all the ſaints. Then alſo was inſtituted the feſtival of *All Saints*.

15. In this period we find the firſt mention made of the *Interdict*, which in later periods was a thing ſo much dreaded by the Chriſtian world; and it is amuſing to obſerve from what cauſes things which had ſo great an influence on human affairs aroſe. On the murder of Prætextatus biſhop of Rouen in A. D. 586, the church was ſhut up, and all divine ſervice omitted till the murderer could be diſcovered. This and ſome other inſtances of interdicts are recorded by Gregory of Tours.

16. Superſtition with reſpect to baptiſm could not have been quite ſo great in this period as it came to be afterwards. For it was celebrated only two days in the year, tho' there was much preparation for it. But when children were in danger of

of dying this ordinance was adminiſtered out of the uſual courſe. It appears from the liturgy of pope Gelaſius, that the majority of baptized infants were the children of Chriſtians.

17. Advent was a feſtival which began to be obſerved in this period.

In the fifteenth year of Juſtinian the Latins began to celebrate the feſtival of the *purification of the virgin* on the 2d of February. Before this time, the Greeks had celebrated a feſtival called *the meeting*, viz. that of Simeon with Mary, when he took the child Jeſus in his arms and bleſſed him. But they did not then invoke the virgin, nor light up candles in honour of her, from which this feſtival obtained the appellation of *Candlemas*. *Sueur* A. D. 442.

18. The firſt council of Orleans in A. D. 511 ordered three days before the aſcenſion to be kept as a faſt, after the manner of lent, with rogations and litanies; and that on thoſe days ſervants ſhould reſt from their labours, keeping to the old rule of the church, not to faſt in the fifty days between Eaſter and Whitſuntide. By an order of the council of Girone thoſe litanies, and this faſt, were put off till the week after Whitſuntide. *Bingham*, p. 560.

19. It is ſtill a doubt with many perſons, whether the obligation to refrain from eating blood, and animals that have been ſtrangled, does not continue on the authority of the apoſtles. It is ſtrictly obſerved in the Eaſt to this day. In the ſecond council of Orleans in A. D. 525 they were excommunicated who ate of animals killed by beaſts, thoſe that were ſtrangled, or that died of any diſeaſe.

20. Among the other miſcellaneous articles in this period, it is worth noticing that in A. D. 591, a perſon pretended to be Jeſus Chriſt, and was accompanied by a woman who was called Mary. He had more than three hundred followers, who were guilty of great outrages. As he was going to attack Aurelius a biſhop in France, ſome of the biſhop's friends met him, and pretending to do him reverence, ſtabbed him, on which his followers were diſperſed.

21. As Chriſtians will feel themſelves intereſted in every thing relating to Judaiſm, I would obſerve that when Beliſarius conquered Carthage in A. D. 534, he brought away the ſacred veſſels which had been in the temple at Jeruſalem. They had been carried to Rome by Titus, and thence to Carthage by Genſeric. Juſtinian ſent them to the church at Jeruſalem.

PERIOD

PERIOD XV.

FROM THE RISE OF MAHOMETANISM IN A. D. 608 TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE UNDER CHARLEMAGNE IN A. D. 800.

SECTION I.

Of the controverſy occaſioned by the Monothelites.

THERE is not, perhaps, in the whole compaſs of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, a more melancholy example of the miſchief that may ariſe from metaphyſical ſubtletics, and at the ſame time from the improper interference of the civil magiſtrate to direct the faith of mankind, than in what relates to the *Monothelites*. And this controverſy, like all the preceding ones of any note, related to the ideas which Chriſtians entertained concerning *the perſon of Chriſt*, a ſubject which has been the principal cauſe of diviſion among Chriſtians from the firſt propagation of Chriſtianity to the preſent time.

Tho' the doctrine of the diſtinction of the two natures in Chriſt was eſtabliſhed at the council of Chalcedon, many of the biſhops who received it

ſtill maintained that, in conſequence of the unity of the perſon, there ought not to be aſcribed to him more than *one will*, and *one operation;* and by moderate men it was hoped that the acknowledgment of this would unite the two parties into which the Chriſtian world had long been divided. Theodore biſhop of Pharan in Arabia is ſaid to have been the firſt who advanced this opinion; but it was received by Sergius patriarch of Conſtantinople, who, it is obſerved, was born of Eutychian parents, and therefore might be ſuppoſed to have a leaning to an opinion which ſavoured of that hereſy, which this doctrine of monothelitiſm did.

Sergius pretended that this doctrine had been maintained by Mennas, a former patriarch of Conſtantinople, and, hoping to heal the diviſions in the Chriſtian church, he wrote to ſeveral perſons of eminence on the ſubject, and among others to George ſurnamed Arſan, a Paulianiſt, or Unitarian, to whom he expreſſed his hope of a good effect from it. Indeed with the Paulianiſts, who were probably pretty numerous at this time, Fleury obſerves he could not but find approvers. For, believing Chriſt to be a mere man, they could not attribute to him more than one will and one operation. The patriarchs of Alexandria being generally oppoſed to thoſe of Conſtantinople, John, who

who then occupied the former of theſe ſees, was ſo far from concurring with Sergius in this meaſure, that he would have propoſed the depoſition of him on account of this letter of his to George, but that an incurſion which the Perſians then made into Egypt prevented it.

The emperor Heraclius, ſeeing his dominions ſuffer ſo much by diviſions among Chriſtians, eagerly joined with Sergius in this ſcheme of uniting them; and with this view held a conference with the chief of the Severian Eutychians in Armenia, and with the concurrence of Sergius he wrote to Arcadius archbiſhop of Cyprus on the ſubject. This letter he read to Cyrus biſhop of Phaſis, and metropolitan of that country. But Cyrus, not entering at that time into the emperor's views, anſwered him by appealing to the celebrated letter of pope Leo at the time of the council of Chalcedon, which he ſaid evidently indicated two operations in Chriſt. But not chuſing to ſay any thing more in oppoſition to the emperor, he wrote to Sergius on the ſubject, and his letter is dated A. D. 626. Sergius replied that the council had not determined any thing definitively on the ſubject, which was not then agitated, but that Cyril had advanced that there was only one vivifying operation in Chriſt, and he denied that the letter of Leo favoured the contrary opinion. He alſo ſaid that he did not know

that any of the Fathers had maintained the doctrine of two operations, and that we ought to conform to their doctrine, without making any innovations.

The Eutychians were as much inclined to monothelitism as the Unitarians. For to acknowledge but one will in Christ was to acknowledge, as they thought, but one nature. On this principle, Athanasius patriarch of the Jacobites, being promised by the emperor to be made bishop of Antioch if he would acknowledge the council of Chalcedon, consented, and in this Cyrus then concurred; and George patriarch of Alexandria dying at that time, Cyrus succeeded him, and joined Theodore bishop of Pharan in the profession of the same sentiments.

By means of this new doctrine Cyrus succeeded in reconciling the Theodosian sect of the Eutychians, which was very numerous. This union took place at Antioch A. D. 633, all these sectaries entering the great church of that city, and receiving the communion in it. But they boasted that it was not they who had received the council of Chalcedon, but that the council had come over to them; for that by acknowledging but one operation in Christ, it was acknowledged that he had only one nature. Sophronius, a monk of great celebrity in those parts, and afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem, remonstrated strongly against the articles of this

union,

union, both with Cyrus and Sergius, but without effect. He will appear to have been the principal promoter of the oppoſition that was made to the new meaſures.

In order to gain pope Honorius, Sergius wrote to him on the occaſion, giving him a hiſtory of what had paſſed in the Eaſt with reſpect to it, mentioning the letter of Mennas to pope Vigilius, and profeſſing to have no opinion of his own on the ſubject. He mentioned with regret the oppoſition of Sophronius to the union that had taken place with the Eutychians, which he thought a happy event, and ſtated the metaphyſical difficulties which occurred on the queſtion, and which he thought it beſt to avoid by general expreſſions.

The pope in his anſwer expreſſed himſelf pleaſed with the letter of Sergius, commended him for his endeavours to prevent diſputes about novel expreſſions, which he ſaid might ſcandalize the ſimple, and that he acknowledged but one will in Chriſt, becauſe the divinity had taken not our ſin, but our nature only, as it was created before the fall, and which could, therefore, (we may ſuppoſe he would have ſaid,) have no will different from that of the divinity. He farther ſaid that he did not ſee that either the councils, or the ſcriptures, authorized us to ſay that there was either one or two operations, and concluded with ſtating the

the difficulty of inſiſting on either of theſe expreſſions, leſt the one ſhould be conſtrued into Neſtorianiſm, and the other into Eutychianiſm.

Sophronius, on being made biſhop of Jeruſalem, in the confeſſion of his faith which it was then uſual to make on thoſe occaſions, ſaid that there was in Chriſt a *theandrique operation*, or ſomething of a middle nature between the divine and the human. On this Honorius wrote to him, and alſo to Cyrus, expreſſing his diſapprobation of the new terms, of one operation or two, as novelties which might obſcure the doctrine of the church. Sophronius, in his anſwer, complied ſo far as to promiſe that he would not ſpeak of two operations, provided that Cyrus would ceaſe to ſpeak of one. At leaſt his deputies promiſed this for him. This, however, had no effect. On the contrary, Sophronius continued to oppoſe the Monothelites, and collected in two volumes ſix hundred paſſages from the Fathers to confute them. But this only irritated them the more. Perceiving that he gained nothing by this means, he ſent Stephen biſhop of Dora to Rome, in order to procure a formal condemnation of this new doctrine; and notwithſtanding the attempts of the Monothelites to prevent him, the biſhop arrived at Rome, but probably not till after the death of Honorius. However, Sophronius himſelf died firſt a ſhort time after the taking

taking of Jeruſalem by the Saracens in A. D. 636.

The emperor Heraclius, willing to prevent the riſing ſtorm, publiſhed what was termed an *ecthe-ſis*, or expoſition of the Chriſtian doctrine on this ſubject, compoſed by Sergius, in which he diſclaimed the terms one operation or two, but maintained that in Chriſt there was only one will, ſaying that, if even Neſtorius, who admitted two natures, yet acknowledged only one will, much more ought the Catholics; and that the fleſh of Chriſt animated by a rational ſoul had never any natural motion ſeparate from, or contrary to, that of the logos which was united to it. This ecthefis was adopted by a council held at Conſtantinople, and was received by all the biſhops of the Eaſt. It did not, however, give the ſame ſatisfaction at Rome, where a council was held under John IV, which condemned it. And then the emperor, perceiving the offence it had given, diſclaimed being the author of it, and aſcribed it wholly to Sergius.

Since, however, his predeceſſor Honorius had appeared to favour the Monothelites, pope John thought it neceſſary to write to the emperor in his vindication; ſaying that, tho' he denied two contrary wills in man, or the human nature of Chriſt, which other men derive from Adam, he maintained only one will of the humanity, and one of the

the divinity. "If," says he, on this occasion, "we "maintain that Christ had only one will, we must "deny either his divinity, or his humanity; and "if the two natures have but one will, we not only "confound the wills, but the natures too."

From this time the popes were uniformly zealous against the Monothelites, and pope Theodore wrote to Paul the patriarch of Constantinople, who had succeeded Sergius, requesting him to hold a council for the purpose of condemning the ecthesis of Heraclius; but little attention was given to this demand. However, Sergius the metropolitan of Cyprus, wrote to the pope to express on this occasion his submission to the holy see, as founded on the power given to Peter. Stephen bishop of Dora also wrote to complain to the pope of the conduct of Paul, in consequence of which the pope made him his vicar in Palestine, with power to regulate all ecclesiastical matters, and especially to depose the bishops whom Sergius had irregularly ordained. Accordingly Stephen acknowledged none to be lawful bishops but those who renounced the ecthesis of Heraclius. But many churches appointed no other bishops in the place of those whom he deposed. The bishops of Africa also wrote to the pope, declaring against the Monothelites.

In

In this controverſy, as well as that which followed on the ſubject of image worſhip, the monks took a part oppoſite to that of the court of Conſtantinople, and the ſame with that of the pope; and the perſon who diſtinguiſhed himſelf the moſt in this buſineſs was Maximus, ſome of whoſe writings are come down to us. Being in Africa at the ſame time with Pyrrhus, who had retired from the ſee of Conſtantinople, they had a conference on this ſubject, in which Pyrrhus maintained the doctrine of the Monothelites, and Maximus the contrary. On this occaſion Pyrrhus acknowledged a compound will in Chriſt. But this would not ſatisfy Maximus, who maintained that, tho' Chriſt had the affections of hunger and thirſt, &c. it was not neceſſarily, but voluntarily. The eſſential properties of humanity, he ſaid, prove his human nature, but the manner of his holding them proves the myſtery of the union. On this Pyrrhus adviſed to drop theſe ſubtletics, which he ſaid the common people would not underſtand, and content themſelves with ſaying that Chriſt is perfect God and perfect man, without troubling themſelves any farther and alſo with the decrees of former councils, which ſaid nothing about one will or two. But this would not ſatisfy Maximus, who ſaid that, as a proof that there may be two diſtinct operations in the ſame ſubſtance, a hot knife

knife both cuts and burns at the ſame time. In the iſſue Pyrrhus yielded, or ſeemed to yield, to the reaſons of Maximus, and afterwards went to Rome to make his retractation before the pope, and on this the pope acknowledged him for the lawful patriarch of Conſtantinople.

This retractation of Pyrrhus was the occaſion of ſeveral councils being held in Africa, the decrees of which were all againſt the Monothelites, and were calculated to induce Paul, who held the ſee of Conſtantinople, to conform to what they called the doctrine of the church. Fortunius, however, the biſhop of Carthage was a Monothelite, and joined Paul at Conſtantinople.

Paul, preſſed by theſe remonſtrances, and eſpecially in his controverſy with the pope's legates, wrote to the pope an explanation of his opinions, alleging that the reaſon why he allowed only one will to Chriſt was not to aſcribe to him any contrariety or difference of will, and thus introduce two perſons. But his letter gave no ſatisfaction at Rome, or to the biſhops of Africa, and thoſe of the Weſt in general, who held with the pope.

It appearing neceſſary, however, to do ſomething to content the Africans, then invaded by the Saracens, the emperor Conſtans, who had ſucceeded Heraclius, thought proper to recall the ecthefis of his predeceſſor, and by a new edict to order that there

there ſhould be no more diſputing on the ſubject, but that all perſons ſhould abide by the deciſions of the five general councils, and the language of the Fathers, without particular explanations. This edict was called the *Type*, or *formulary*.

Pope Theodore, ſeeing that neither his letters nor his legates had any ſucceſs to bring back Paul of Conſtantinople to the Catholic faith, pronounced againſt him the ſentence of depoſition. This was probably in a council convened for the purpoſe, and in the ſame he condemned Pyrrhus; who having gone from Rome to Ravenna there renewed his profeſſion of Monothelitiſm, having been probably gained by the exarch with the hope of his ſucceeding to the ſee of Conſtantinople. Paul, hearing of his depoſition overturned the altar which the pope had at Conſtantinople in the oratory of the palace, forbade his legates to celebrate maſs there, and even perſecuted them, and other Catholic biſhops, ſome with impriſonment, ſome with baniſhment, and others with corporal puniſhment.

Martin, who ſucceeded Theodore in A. D. 649, immediately on his acceſſion called a council, which conſiſted of one hundred and five Italian biſhops, and after five ſolemn ſeſſions, in which he had inveighed bitterly againſt the Monothelites, as Acephali, and Apollinarians, and againſt the

conduct of Paul and Pyrrhus, ſentence of condemnation was paſſed on all thoſe who held that in Chriſt there was only one will and one operation. They included in their anathemas Paul, Pyrrhus, and in general all thoſe who received either the ecthesis of Heraclius, or the impious type of Conſtans.

As the writings of the Catholic Fathers were admitted as authorities in the proceedings of this council, and the ſpurious ones of Dionyſius the Areopagite were not then queſtioned, the pope was at much pains to explain the phraſe *theandrique operation*, which occurs in it, as ſignifying in reality not one, but two operations, viz. of the God, and of the man. All the diſcourſes delivered at this council, Fleury obſerves, were probably precompoſed, few perſons being at that time qualified to ſpeak extempore, as in the former councils; and the Latin tongue being much corrupted, they were aſhamed to write as they ſpake. Vol. 8. p. 417. It muſt be added that Paul biſhop of Theſſalonica, appearing to favour the principles of the Monothelites in his ſynodical letter, was excommunicated by the pope.

Tho' the pope carried every thing thus triumphantly in the Weſt, what he did there had no effect in the Eaſt. On the contrary, the emperor was ſo provoked at his conduct, that he ſent orders

to

to the exarch Olympius to oblige all the biſhops and landholders in his juriſdiction to ſubſcribe his *type*; and if he was ſure of the army, to ſeize the pope himſelf. This order was given before the emperor had heard of the preceding council. Olympius, finding the council aſſembled, and perceiving that he could not depend upon the army, formed a deſign to aſſaſſinate the pope; but this ſcheme failing he went to Sicily to oppoſe the Saracens, and being defeated he there died.

His ſucceſſor Theodore had the ſame orders to ſeize the pope, on the accuſation of hereſy, for having condemned the type, and not ſufficiently honouring the mother of God. For by the Monothelites the Catholics were always charged with Neſtorianiſm. He was alſo accuſed of favouring the Saracens. The exarch, having received theſe orders, actually ſeized the pope, tho' he was ſick, and had his bed carried to the porch of the church of Lateran, and Eugenius was made pope by the authority of the emperor.

Martin, being thus made a priſoner, was conducted from place to place in his way to Conſtantinople, and ſpent a whole year in the iſle of Naxos. At length he arrived at Conſtantinople in A. D. 654, where he was kept a priſoner three months without being allowed to ſpeak to any perſon, and after an irregular and inſulting trial on the ſubject,

being accuſed chiefly of crimes of ſtate, he was delivered over to the executioner, confined among the common malefactors, and treated with great inhumanity. After being kept ſeveral months in this ſituation, he was, at the interceſſion of the patriarch Paul, not put to death, but baniſhed to Epheſus, where he complained that he was deſtitute of neceſſaries, and where he died. A. D. 655.

Paul dying, Peter the new patriarch of Conſtantinople ſent his ſynodical letter, containing, as uſual, a confeſſion of his faith to Rome; but as he did not in it make mention of two wills and two operations, it was rejected by pope Eugenius and the people.

The monk Maximus having great influence in all the Eaſt, it was thought of particular conſequence to gain him to the ſide of the court; but the methods that were taken to intimidate him were altogether unſucceſsful. He underwent as rigorous an examination as the pope, and, like him, conſtantly refuſing to communicate with the Monothelites, he, and two of his diſciples of the name of Anaſtaſius, were baniſhed to Thrace, where they were left in a very deſtitute condition. Commiſſioners, however, were ſent to hold a conference with him in the place of his exile; and after this he was reconducted to Conſtantinople, where ſtill perſiſting in his opinions and conduct, he was expoſed

poſed to the groſſeſt inſults, and conducted to a priſon at Perbere. After this, a council being held on the ſubject at Conſtantinople, this old man with his two diſciples were ſentenced to be publickly whipped, to have their tongues cut out, and their right hands cut off, then to be expoſed in all the ſtreets of Conſtantinople, and to be ſent into baniſhment into the country of the Lazi; and this horrid ſentence was actually executed.

In the ſame council pope Martin, Sophronius of Jeruſalem, and all their adherents, were anathematized. Maximus was confined in a caſtle called Schamaki, near the country of the Alans, where he died A. D. 662. He left many writings, eſpecially on the ſubject of Monothelitiſm, on which his mind had been ſo much employed. One of his diſciples, Anaſtaſius Apocriſiaire, was permitted, after much ill uſage, to retire to a monaſtery, where, tho' he had been deprived of one of his hands, he wrote books. He died in the caſtle of Thaſcume A. D. 666.

The next emperor, Conſtantine Pogonatus, finding it, no doubt, to be his intereſt to gain the pope, without which he could not expect any aid from the Weſt, of which the Eaſtern empire then ſtood in great need, adopted meaſures the reverſe of thoſe of his predeceſſors; and a change in the ſentiments, at leaſt in the conduct, of the biſhops

immediately, as is uſual, followed this change in the court; and from this time the cauſe of Monothelitiſm, which had been ſo triumphant, ſuddenly declined.

This emperor began by expreſſing his willingneſs to compoſe the differences that had ariſen between the biſhops of the Eaſt and the ſee of Rome, in a letter to the pope, dated A. D. 678, in which he promiſed a ſafe conduct to any biſhops that ſhould be ſent to a conference or council to be held at Conſtantinople on the ſubject of Monothelitiſm. On this pope Agathon held a council, and in conſequence of it addreſſed a letter to the emperor, in which he gave the reaſons for the faith of the church of Rome (which he ſays could not err, according to the promiſe of Chriſt to Peter) in favour of the doctrine of two wills and two operations in Chriſt; expreſſing his hope that the biſhops in the Eaſt would conform to it. At the ſame time he apologizes for the want of erudition in the perſons he ſhould ſend to the council, on account of the rude ſtate of Europe at that time. The letter from the council is in the ſame ſtrain, complaining of the decay of literature, (of which Fleury ſays their letter is itſelf a proof,) on account of their being to provide for their ſubſiſtence by their labour, to which they had been reduced by the devaſtations which the Barbarians had made in the

the patrimonies of their churches. But notwithſtanding this they expreſſed the greateſt firmneſs in the confeſſion of their faith, and declared they ſhould receive as brothers thoſe who joined them in it, but ſhould reject, and not even bear the ſociety of, thoſe who ſhould renounce it.

Whatever was done at Rome was ſure to be acceded to by all the churches in her communion. Theodore archbiſhop of Canterbury held a council in A. D. 680, on the ſubject of Monothelitiſm, in which all the biſhops aſſembled profeſſed to receive the five general councils, and alſo the late one held by pope Martin. This, being carried to Rome, gave great ſatisfaction.

In conſequence of the meaſures that had been taken in this new ſtate of things, deputies were ſent from Italy to Conſtantinople; and on their arrival another general council, called the *ſixth*, began to be held A. D. 680, and the emperor himſelf accompanied by thirteen of his principal officers, preſided in it.

In this council the doctrine of the Monothelites was maintained by Macarius biſhop of Antioch, and that of the other party by the legates from Rome, evidently favoured by the emperor, and the appeal was made to the language of the Chriſtian Fathers. So far was there from being any freedom of debate in this aſſembly, that in the eighth

ſeſſion Macarius was condemned and depoſed, in the ninth the clergy from Rome puſhed him by the ſhoulders out of the council, and Theophanes the abbot of Baie in Sicily, who had defended what was deemed the orthodox faith againſt him, was put in his place. In the tenth ſeſſion, when the emperor left his ſeat to four commiſſioners, the late patriarchs of Conſtantinople, viz. Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, and alſo Honorius the late pope, were anathematized, as having held heretical and impious doctrine. Polychronius, a prieſt and monk, being examined before the council, acknowledged himſelf a Monothelite, and propoſed to prove the truth of of his doctrine by raiſing a dead man to life. But the trial being made without effect, he alſo was degraded and excommunicated.

Conſtantine, a prieſt of the church of Apamea, demanding to be heard, adviſed the abſtaining from perſecution on account of any opinion on the ſubject in queſtion; but appearing to be in fact a Monothelite, ſaying that Chriſt diveſted himſelf of fleſh and blood upon the croſs, and that then he had only one will, which was that of the divinity, he was declared to be a heretic, as holding the doctrine of the Manicheans, and of Apollinarius.

In the laſt ſeſſion the emperor attended in perſon, when one hundred and ſixty biſhops were preſent,

ſent, tho' they were only forty at the firſt. He confirmed the decrees of the council, and forbade any more diſputing on the ſubject; declaring that any biſhop, clerical perſon, or monk, who did not conform to the acts of this council, ſhould be depoſed; that if he held any public office he ſhould be deprived of it, and have his goods confiſcated, and if he was a private perſon, he ſhould be baniſhed fifteen miles from Conſtantinople, or any other city.

Pope Agathon dying preſently after the celebration of this council, the acts of it were confirmed by Leo, who ſucceeded him, and who joined in anathematizing all who had been condemned by it, pope Honorius among the reſt. But when he ſent an account of this council to the biſhops in Spain, and mentioned the condemnation of his predeceſſor Honorius, it was for not having obſerved the apoſtolic traditions, which, as Fleury ſays, was to intimate that his offence was perſonal, and did not prejudice the apoſtolic ſee. But if one pope and his council might err, why might not another, and conſequently all of them?

The ſucceeding pope Benedict took much pains to bring over to the Catholic faith Macarius the late biſhop of Antioch, who lived in exile at Rome, but without any effect.

The emperor, whoſe object had been to conciliate the biſhops of Rome, in order to pay a farther compliment to them, ſent the hair of his two ſons thither, and it was received by the pope, the clergy and the army, in token of their having adopted them, a cuſtom made uſe of for that purpoſe in thoſe times.

As no canons had been made in either of the two laſt general councils, another was aſſembled by the emperor Juſtinian II in A. D, 692, commonly denominated, from the place where it was convened, within the precincts of the palace, in *Trullo*. One hundred and eleven biſhops met on this occaſion, and enacted many canons relating to diſcipline, which are obſerved by the Greek church to this day. The principal of them were that none of the clergy might marry after their ordination, and that biſhops muſt abſtain from any commerce with the wives they had before their ordination, but that prieſts, deacons and ſubdeacons may cohabit with them, except on thoſe days on which they approach the ſacred myſteries.

The emperor ſent copies of the decrees of this council to Rome; but tho' they had been ſigned by the pope's legates at the time, he refuſed to confirm them, on account, as Fleury ſays, of its being forbidden in them to faſt on ſaturdays, except on that before Eaſter ſunday, which was contrary to the

the cuſtom obſerved at Rome, and which was expreſsly ordered to be corrected. The emperor was ſo much provoked at this refuſal, that he ſent to have the pope apprehended; but the officer ſent to execute this commiſſion with great difficulty eſcaped the reſentment of the Roman populace. Afterwards, however, the emperor ſent thoſe decrees to the ſucceding pope John VII in the year A. D. 705, and, with human weakneſs, ſays Fleury, he returned them without any alteration.

The archbiſhop of Aquileia and his ſuffragans held a council, in which they objected to the receiving of the fifth general council, but they were reconciled to it by pope Sergius, who died in A. D. 701.

The emperor Philippicus, who dethroned Juſtinian, was a Monothelite; and he reverſed every thing that had been done againſt them; ſuch influence had the imperial power in all theſe proceedings. He ſummoned a council in which the laſt was condemned, and, as far as appears, without any oppoſition. He expelled the patriarch Cyrus, and put in his place John, who was a Monotheliſt like himſelf. In theſe proceedings he was ſupported by Germanus the metropolitan of Cyzicus, Andrew biſhop of Crete, and many other perſons of great eminence. He even perſecuted thoſe who refuſed to ſubſcribe the decrees of this council, baniſhing

niſhing ſome of them, and had the acts of the preceding general council publickly burned.

At Rome, however, open reſiſtance was made to all the attempts of this emperor to enforce the decrees of this new council, and a ſedition was occaſioned by the ſending of the emperor's letters on the ſubject from Ravenna, in which more than twenty-five perſons were killed in the ſtreets.

Preſently after this Philippicus was depoſed, and Anaſtaſius, who was no Monothelite, ſucceeding him, all the biſhops then preſent at Conſtantinople, and all the clergy of the place, proclaimed the ſixth council. The new patriarch of Conſtantinople wrote to the pope to apologize for his conduct, in joining with Philippicus, as having acted by conſtraint.

Coſmas the Melchite, patriarch of Alexandria, abandoned the hereſy of the Monothelites, which had been held by the Melchites from the time of the patriarch Cyrus. This Coſmas could neither write nor read, and was by trade a needle maker; ſo low was this once magnificent ſee at this time. Indeed the Melchites had but one ſmall church in Alexandria, all the reſt being held by the Jacobites, or Eutychians. The Nubians alſo were all Jacobites in A. D. 740, and ſo are the Abyſſinians to this day.

No

No whole deſcription of men continued the profeſſion of Monotheliteiſm except the *Maronites*, a people ſo called from inhabiting a diſtrict near mount Libanus in Syria, called *Maronis*, or *Maronia*. They were all avowed Monothelites till of late years, when, as it is ſaid, they ſubjected themſelves to the church of Rome. *Sueur* A. D. 676.

SECTION II.

Of the Riſe and Progreſs of Mahometaniſm.

THIS period of our hiſtory is chiefly diſtinguiſhed by the riſe, and wonderfully rapid progreſs, of a new religion, which for ſome time threatened the extirpation of Chriſtianity, and all other religions whatever. But the circumſtances in which it roſe, and the manner in which it was propagated, were exceedingly different from thoſe which I have related concerning the promulgation of Chriſtianity, and certainly much leſs favourable to its evidence, as will appear from the following ſuccinct account.

The founder of this religion was Mahomet, an Arab of the tribe of Koreiſh, born at Mecca A. D. 568. When he was two years old he loſt his father Abdalla, and the family being in low circumſtances,

ſtances, his uncle Abutaleb took the care of his education, and employed him in merchandiſe; and in this capacity he travelled to Damaſcus in Syria. After this a rich widow, of the name of Kadijah, employed him as her factor, and then married him, when he was twenty years old, and ſhe forty. By her he had ſeveral children, and among them a daughter of the name of Fatima.

At the age of forty Mahomet, having firſt prepared himſelf by retiring to a cave in the neighbourhood of Mecca, in the month Ramadan, began to aſſume the character of a prophet. His firſt convert was his wife, to whom he opened the ſecret of his miſſion in the cave, but it was with much difficulty, and two years after this retired and auſtere life, that he gained her. During four years he taught only in private, and did not advance his pretenſions except to thoſe with whom he might naturally expect to have the moſt influence. His ſecond convert was his ſlave Zeyde, to whom he thereupon gave his liberty; and hence it became a law with the Mahometans to make their ſlaves free whenever they embrace their religion. His third convert was Ali, the ſon of Abutaleb his uncle, and the fourth Abubeker, who being a man of character and fortune, was ſoon followed by five others, who were afterwards the principal generals of his armies. Having gained thoſe nine diſciples, he

he began to preach more openly. This was in the forty-fourth year of his age; and in the fifth year of his pretended miſſion he had thirty-nine diſciples. However the men of his tribe in general treated him as a madman, or an impoſtor, and continually demanded of him to prove his divine miſſion by miracles. But to this he always anſwered that God did not ſend him to work miracles, but only to preach; that God had worked miracles enow by Moſes, Jeſus Chriſt, and other prophets, and that if he had worked miracles they would not believe in him. At this time tho' ſome of the Arabs profeſſed the Jewiſh religion and others the Chriſtian, the generality were Sabians, or worſhippers of the ſun, moon and ſtars. In general they were very ignorant, and it was but a little before the time of Mahomet that his tribe had acquired the arts of writing and reading, and it is ſaid that he himſelf underſtood neither. He pretended to have frequent conferences with the angel Gabriel, and that he dictated to him from time to time certain compoſitions calculated to ſupport his miſſion, and encourage his diſciples, mixed with precepts of morality, religion, and legiſlation. Theſe being collected after his death compoſed the *Koran*, or the Bible of the Mahometans.

Mahomet did not pretend that his religion was new, but the ſame with that of Abraham and Iſh-

mael

mael in its purity. The doctrines on which he laid the chief ſtreſs were that there is one God, the creator of all things, who had ſent prophets from time to time to inſtruct mankind, as Noah, Abraham, Moſes, and Jeſus, whom he ſaid the Jews would have put to death thro' envy, but that God delivered him by a miracle. Both the Jews and Chriſtians, he ſaid, had corrupted their ſcriptures, and run into idolatry. He therefore taught that men ſhould worſhip only one God, without aſcribing to him ſons or daughters, or giving to any other perſon honours properly divine, that himſelf was the laſt prophet; that there will be a reſurrection of the dead, and a future judgment, and that there will be a paradiſe in which the good ſhall enjoy all the pleaſures of ſenſe, and eſpecially the ſociety of beautiful women.

He directed that prayers ſhould be made five times a day, at ſtated hours, and that purity of body, conſiſting of the waſhing of the face, feet, and hands, was neceſſary to prayer. He maintained the rite of circumciſion, abſtinence from wine, from blood, and from hog's fleſh, a faſt all the month Ramadan, and the ſanctification of friday for the purpoſe of public worſhip, in which he followed an antient cuſtom of the Arabs. *Sueur* A. D. 622. He particularly recommended pilgrimages to Mecca, to viſit a ſquare temple called the

the Caaba, which was held in great veneration by the Arabs, the foundation of it being attributed to Abraham; and the greateſt reſpect was paid to a black ſtone in it. Alſo prayer was to be made in all parts of the world with the face towards this place. He ſtrongly recommended the giving of alms, and paying tithes.

This religion he ſaid was to be defended and propagated with the ſword, and he promiſed the joys of paradiſe to thoſe who ſhould die fighting againſt infidels, and threatened the pains of hell to thoſe who on thoſe occaſions ſtayed idly at home, unleſs they contributed to the expence of the war. He taught that all idolaters, and alſo thoſe who deſerted his religion after making profeſſion of it, were to be exterminated; but Jews and Chriſtians he tolerated on paying a tax. He inſiſted upon the doctrine of predeſtination in its moſt rigid ſenſe, and chiefly recommended ſubmiſſion to the will of God, from which he denominated his religion *iſlamiſm*, a word which in Arabic denotes as much. Hence his followers were called *Moſlems*, and commonly *Muſulmen*.

The increaſe of Mahomet's followers excited the jealouſy and hatred of his tribe; and being perſecuted and baniſhed by them he fled to Medina, a city about ſixty leagues from Mecca, where he had ſome diſciples. This was A. D. 622, and

from this flight to Medina the Mahometans date their years, calling it the æra of the *hegira*. At Medina Mahomet armed his followers, and on his defeating a party of Jews and Koreſhites his ſect greatly increaſed. In the ſixth year of the hegira he made a truce with them, and in the ſame year his followers ſwore allegiance to him as their prince and legiſlator, as well as prophet. As a lawgiver he allowed every man four wives, beſides concubines, with the liberty of divorce; but he himſelf had a much greater number, which, as he ſaid, was a privilege peculiar to himſelf.

The Koreſhites having broken the truce in A. D. 629. he marched againſt them with an army of ten thouſand men, and entering Mecca in triumph, his authority was acknowledged there. After this he ſtill continued to reſide at Medina, and only went to Mecca in pilgrimage in the tenth year of the hegira, and in the year following he died, in the ſixty-third year of his age, after he had conquered almoſt the whole of Arabia.

Mahomet having no ſon, he was ſucceeded by Abubeker, the father of his favourite wife. He took the title of *Calif*, that is vicar, or lieutenant of the prophet. It was he who collected the chapters of the Koran, and publiſhed them in one volume. He reigned two years, and his juſtice and diſintereſtedneſs are highly ſpoken of. He defeated

two

two other profeſſed prophets Armed and Mouſulem who aroſe a little before the death of Mahomet, and alſo a third named Talitia. In his ſhort reign his followers conquered the Arabs bordering on Perſia. His ſucceſſor Omar took the title of *Commander of the faithful*, which deſcended to his ſucceſſors. In his reign of ten years he added Perſia, Syria, and Egypt to his empire, and in A. D. 713 the Arabs, or Saracens, took poſſeſſion of almoſt the whole of Spain. Then they paſſed the Pyrennees, and were for ſome time maſters of nearly one half of France, when they were defeated, and driven out, by Charles Martel, mayor of the palace, and in fact king of France. In A. D. 739 the Saracens made a ſecond invaſion of France, when they took Marſeilles, Avignon, and the greateſt part of the ſouthern provinces; but on the Lombards joining the French againſt them, they withdrew into Spain.

The Saracens plundered and deſtroyed many monaſteries in France, and put to death ſeveral of the monks, but eſpecially in their retreat, after being defeated.

When the biſhops of Jeruſalem, Antioch, and other places, could not exerciſe their functions after thoſe cities were poſſeſſed by the Saracens, the council in Trullo allowed them their rank and power; and when they died others were ordained

in their place, whence came the cuſtom of ordaining biſhops in *partibus*, that is, in *partibus infidelium*.

When we conſider the extreme bigotry of the Catholic Chriſtians at the time of the propagation of Mahometaniſm with reſpect to the moſt prominent doctrine of the Mahometan creed, viz. that of the unity of God, in oppoſition to that of a trinity in the divine nature, we cannot be ſurprized at the offence that was taken at it, and that Mahometans in return ſhould entertain an utter deteſtation of the creed of ſuch Chriſtians.

In the laſt expiring ſtate of the Catholic churches in Africa, they obliged their converts not only to renounce Mahometaniſm, but to ſay, in their confeſſion of faith, "I curſe the God of Mahomet, "who he ſays is one intire deity, neither begetting, "nor being begotten, and like to whom there is "no other Being. And I believe in the Father, "the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, the holy, coeſ-"ſential, and undivided trinity." *Robinſon* p. 115. Few Chriſtians I preſume of the preſent age would think this conduct prudent, whether they could conſcientiouſly adopt this language or not.

SECTION

SECTION III.

Of the Controverſy relating to the Worſhip of Images.

IN the progreſs of ſuperſtition it was natural to expect that a particular regard would be paid to the relics of the Chriſtian martyrs, and to any thing that could aſſiſt in recollecting their virtues, and among theſe *pictures* and *images* had, no doubt, their uſe. But from this natural and allowable, becauſe uſeful, kind of reſpect, the tranſition, in this period, among people who had not loſt all traces of heatheniſm (in which image worſhip was a predominant feature) to a ſuperſtitious and undue reverence, was but too eaſy. The common people, not content with gazing at ſuch images, and receiving ſome inſtruction, and ſome good impreſſions, from them, which was the uſe that was firſt made of them, began to bow down before them, as if the perſons whoſe images they were had themſelves been preſent; and Chriſt being then conſidered as God, his picture, or image, was worſhipped, as he himſelf was. This practice was probably encouraged with a view to draw the Heathens from the worſhip of their idols, on the ſame principle as their feſtivals had been kept up with a nominal change in the object and uſe of them.

Many perſons, however, of juſter views, and greater diſcernment, did not fail to remonſtrate againſt this practice, and among theſe the perſons who took the greateſt offence at it in the Eaſt were Conſtantine, the biſhop of Nacolia, and the emperor Leo Iſauricus, who unhappily (but as we have ſeen it was univerſally done in thoſe times) employed power and violence to gain his purpoſe. The peculiar rage of the Mahometans againſt all image worſhip, as a ſpecies of idolatry, is thought to have drawn the more particular attention of the Chriſtians of this age to the ſubject.

Germanus patriarch of Conſtantinople, as well as the populace of that city, was an advocate for the prevailing ſuperſtition. He wrote ſeveral letters now extant on the ſubject, eſpecially to John biſhop of Synada in Phrygia, the metropolitan of Conſtantine of Nacolia. In theſe letters he diſclaims all proper worſhip except to God, but expreſſes his wiſhes that antient and uſeful cuſtoms might be kept up. He alſo urges the miracles that he ſaid had been wrought by images, eſpecially one of the virgin Mary at Sozopolis in Piſidia, which had ſent a liquid perfume from her painted hand, of which he ſays there were many witneſſes. At the ſame time, however, he diſclaims the uſe of ſtatues. He wrote alſo to pope Gregory on the ſubject, who

in

in return expreſſed his approbation of his ſentiments.

An earthquake happening in an iſland of the archipelago in the tenth year of the emperor Leo, he imagined it was a judgment of God for the worſhip of images; and aſſembling the people of Conſtantinople, he addreſſed them on the ſubject, but in ſuch a manner as gave them great offence. The people of Greece, and the inhabitants of the Cyclades, even made this a pretence for a revolt, and they ſet up another emperor named Coſmas, but their generals being defeated on their approach to Conſtantinople, the revolt was ſuppreſſed. Not content with what he had done himſelf, the emperor, in the year A. D. 730, aſſembled a council at Conſtantinople, in which a decree was made againſt the worſhip of images, and the patriarch Germanus refuſing to ſubſcribe it was depoſed, and ended his days in a monaſtery.

The emperor purſued his purpoſe, and in execution of the orders of the council, began with demoliſhing an image of Chriſt within the precincts of the palace, which was famous for the miracles ſaid to have been wrought by it. But the perſon who executed the order was killed on the ſpot by ſome women. In the place of the image he erected a ſimple croſs, with an inſcription, to ſhew that the image had been removed. The women who

had been guilty of the murder, and ſome other perſons who had been their abettors, were put to death. He did not, however, order the demolition in all places, but contended himſelf with forbidding the worſhip of them. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 90.

It would have been happy if he had contented himſelf with puniſhing perſons for ſuch violent breaches of the peace as this. But his librarian Œcumenicus and twelve of his aſſiſtants, who taught both religion and the ſciences, not complying with the emperor's wiſhes in this buſineſs, he ſurrounded the place with faggots, and burned both them and the library. He then ordered all the images of the virgin Mary and other ſaints to be brought to a public place and burned, and the walls of the churches that had been painted to be white waſhed. They who refuſed to obey the order were puniſhed, ſome with death, and others with mutilation.

When the news of this perſecution reached Italy, the ſtatues of the emperor were thrown down, and trampled upon by the populace of Rome. The emperor, however, wiſhing to gain the pope, ſent him his decree againſt images, promiſing him his favour if he complied with it, and threatening him with depoſition if he did not. The pope, far from complying, exerted himſelf all he could in reſiſting the will of the emperor, tho' he did not, as ſome have ſaid, excommunicate him, (*Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 92.)

p. 92.) and the people of Italy in general took his part. The inhabitants of the Pentapolis alſo, and of the territory of Venice, rejected the orders of the emperor. The clergy even anathematized the exarch Paul, and him that employed him, meaning the emperor himſelf, and all who ſhould obey him; and the people of Italy in general joining them, they reſolved to chuſe another emperor; but the pope, not willing to proceed ſo far, diverted them from their purpoſe. However, in conſequence of this the emperor eventually loſt all the exarchate, which fell to the Lombards.

On the other hand, Exhilaratus duke of Naples, being maſter of Campania, perſuaded the people of that province to obey the emperor, and put the pope to death; but the people of Rome ſeizing him put *him* to death, and his ſon. They alſo expelled Peter the duke of Rome, becauſe they ſuppoſed that he had written to the emperor againſt the pope. At Ravenna the people were divided, and the different parties coming to blows, Paul the exarch was killed.

Gregory III, who ſucceeded Gregory II, in A. D. 731, wrote a long letter of remonſtrance to the emperor on the ſubject of the worſhip of images, defending it as an antient practice, and a worſhip that was only *relative*, and not that of the wood or ſtone of which they conſiſted. God forbid, ſays

he, that we ſhould put our truſt in theſe images. If it be that of our Saviour, we ſay "Lord Jeſus Chriſt, "ſon of God, ſuccour us, ſave us; If it be that of "the virgin Mary, we ſay, holy mother of God pray to thy ſon, that he may ſave our ſouls; If it "be the martyr Stephen, we ſay holy Stephen, who "ſhed your blood for Chriſt, and who have ſo "much influence with him, pray for us." Speaking of the deſign of the emperor to have his predeceſſor carried in chains to Conſtantinople, he ſaid the popes were the mediators and arbiters of peace between the Eaſt and the Weſt. He added "We "fear not your menaces. At the diſtance of a "league from Rome we are in ſafety," meaning in the dominions of the Lombards.

The violence of the emperor induced Gregory to call a council on the ſubject at Rome in A. D. 732, when ninety-three biſhops attended, without including the pope, Anthony archbiſhop of Grada, or John of Ravenna. All the clergy of Rome were alſo preſent with the nobles, the conſuls, and the people in general; when it was unanimouſly agreed that all perſons who ſhould deſtroy, or even ſpeak with contempt of, the holy images ſhould be ſeparated from the communion of the church.

The emperor, provoked at this oppoſition of the pope, and the revolt of Italy, on this occaſion, fitted out a fleet, and ſent it to Italy to ſupport his autho-

authority in that country; but it was ſhipwrecked in the Adriatic. He alſo confiſcated all the patrimony of St. Peter in the countries ſubject to him, which amounted to a very great ſum. In return, the people of Rome took an oath to defend the pope both againſt Leo, and Luitprand king of the Lombards, to whom they ceaſed to pay any tribute; and this was the origin of the temporal power of the popes. tho' they were not yet temporal princes. *Giannone* Vol. 1. p. 246. 248. The emperor alſo impriſoned or baniſhed thoſe in the Eaſt, who did not concur with him with reſpect to images.

John of Damaſcus, many of whoſe writings are now extant, being out of the power of the emperor, wrote on this occaſion in defence of image worſhip, acknowledging the authority of the emperor in things of a civil nature, but ſtrongly diſclaiming it in all things eccleſiaſtical, and forewarning him of the judgments of God for his proceedings againſt his true ſervants, by the example of Saul, Jezebel, and Herod.

In A. D. 754 Conſtantine Copronymus, who ſucceeded Leo, both in the empire, and his zeal againſt image worſhip, held a council at Conſtantinople, of one hundred and thirty-eight biſhops, on the ſubject. It laſted ſix months, and in the confeſſion of faith which they made on this occaſion, they charge the worſhippers of images with many here-

hereſies, eſpecially that of Neſtorius; ſaying that the true image of Chriſt was the Euchariſt, comparing the union of Chriſt with the elements to the union of the logos with human fleſh in the incarnation. The making, or the adoration of, images is by this council forbidden upon pain of depoſition to all clergy, and of anathema to monks and laymen. They conclude with declaring their unanimity in this buſineſs, and with anathemas againſt Germanus of Conſtantinople, George of Cyprus, and John of Damaſcus. In conſequence of this council images were burned in all the churches, and effaced from the walls on which they were painted. Copronymus moreover ordered his ſubjects to worſhip one God, that no perſon ſhould be called a ſaint, that no relics ſhould be adored, no departed ſpirits invoked, not even the virgin Mary herſelf; who he ſaid was after the birth of Jeſus no more than any other woman. *Rouiſon* p. 169.

The perſon who ſuffered the moſt for defending the worſhip of images at this time was the monk Stephen of Auxence. He was cruelly uſed by the emperor, and after having been long baniſhed, was reported to have wrought many miracles by preſenting an image of Chriſt to be worſhipped by ſick perſons. Being interrogated on the ſubject of his faith in the preſence of the emperor, he diſclaimed all

all worſhip of the materials of which images were made. The emperor at the ſame time diſclaiming all diſreſpect to Chriſt, tho' he trampled upon his image, the monk produced a piece of money on which was the image of the emperor, and throwing it on the ground trampled on it. But for this argument he was ſent to priſon, to be tried for violating a law that had been made with reſpect to ſuch actions. Stephen was afterwards taken out of priſon by order of the emperor, and killed by a blow on the head by one of the perſons who were dragging him about the ſtreets. After he was dead, the body was ſtill dragged about the ſtreets, and much abuſed.

Conſtantine, the late patriarch of Conſtantinople, was brought from the place of his baniſhment, and after a formal degradation carried thro' the ſtreets of Conſtantinople on an aſs, with his face towards the tail, and then beheaded, A. D. 767. This Conſtantine having baptized two of the emperor's children, was juſtly conſidered as an aggravation of this ſhocking cruelty.

The monks in general being advocates for the worſhip of images, the emperor did every thing in his power to ſuppreſs them, after uſing both promiſes and threatnings to gain them, putting out the eyes of many, and baniſhing others.

The

The Weſtern church was as zealous in the defence of image worſhip as the Eaſtern in the ſuppreſſion of it. At a council held at Rome in A. D. 769, it was decreed that the relics and images of the ſaints ſhould be honoured according to antient uſage, and the council held at Conſtantinople was anathematized; but the ſhocking cruelties practiced in the Eaſt were not imitated in the Weſt.

Leo the ſon of Conſtantine was as great an enemy of image worſhip as his father; but on his death, Irene his widow being a ſtrenuous advocate for them, and her ſon Conſtantine being only ten years of age, and ſhe governing in his name, things ſoon took a different turn, both with reſpect to the worſhip of images, and the monaſtic life, which any perſon was now at full liberty to embrace. And there cannot be a greater proof of the deciſive influence of power in all proceedings of this nature, than the ſudden tranſition from ſeeming unanimity on one ſide of the queſtion to as great apparent unanimity on the oppoſite ſide. It was probably the ſame political motive that operated in this caſe as in that of the Monothelites. The concurrence of the popes, and of the powers of the Weſt, was thought neceſſary in the then hazardous ſtate of the Grecian empire.

In A. D. 784 Paul the patriarch of Conſtantinople, being ſick, retired to a monaſtery, when, being

being viſited by the emperor, and empreſs. and no doubt being apprized of their views, he acknowledged his weakneſs in joining in the condemnation of image worſhip, in obedience to the orders of the former emperors and preſently after this confeſſion he died. His ſucceſſor Taraſius, as well apprized of the new ſtate of things, refuſed to accept of that dignity, unleſs a general council was called to heal the diviſions of the church on the ſubject of image worſhip. Application was then made to the pope, who conſented to the calling of the council, provided the firſt thing that ſhould be done was the anathematizing of the former council. He even expreſſed his wiſh that, if it were poſſible, the images might be replaced in the churches before the council was held.

With ſome difficulty legates from the churches of Jeruſalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, were procured to attend this council, the Saracens to whom thoſe cities were now ſubject being naturally jealous of ſuch aſſemblies. At length, the firſt of Auguſt A. D. 786, was fixed for the holding of this council, in the church of the twelve apoſtles at Conſtantinople. But the majority of the Eaſtern biſhops being againſt the worſhip of images, or as they were then called *Iconoclaſts*, and the deſign of the council being well known, they were very clamorous againſt it, as being in direct oppoſition to that

that which had been held in the ſame place before; and being joined by the old ſoldiers, attached to the principles of the emperor Conſtantine, it was found neceſſary to ſend for other troops to overawe them; and orders were given to hold the council at Nice the 24th of September A. D. 787, where the biſhops accordingly met, to the number of three hundred and ſeventy-ſeven.

The council was opened by a ſpeech of Taraſius patriarch of Conſtantinople, exhorting the biſhops to reject all novelties, and adhere to the traditions of the church, which he ſaid could not err, and ſaid that they who had oppoſed the truth the year before might attend, and give their reaſons. The biſhops accuſed of this refractory diſpoſition being then ordered to enter, the commiſſioners of the emperor read to them a letter which he had addreſſed to them, exhorting them to give peace to the church. Upon this Baſil biſhop of Ancyra, Theodore of Myra, and Theodoſius of Amorium, ſtood up, when the firſt named of them made an ample confeſſion of his former hereſy, and requeſted to be reunited to the Catholic church; ſaying he received with all honour the holy relics of the ſaints. "I adore them," he ſaid, "with venera-
"tion, hoping to partake of their holyneſs. I al-
"ſo receive the venerable images of Jeſus Chriſt,
"of his holy mother, of the angels, and all ſaints.

"I

"I embrace them, and give them the adoration "of honour. I reject and from my heart anathe- "matize the falſe council called the ſeventh, as "contrary to the traditions of the church." He added much more to the ſame purpoſe, and was followed in the ſame ſtrain by the other two.

After this ſeven other biſhops, who had oppoſed the holding of this council the year before, ſtood up, and made their ſubmiſſion. Then, without any debate on the ſubject, followed a diſcuſſion of the manner in which penitents ſhould be received; and one of the biſhops aſking in what rank they ſhould place this new hereſy of the iconoclaſts, which they were aſſembled to oppoſe, John the legate from the churches of Jeruſalem and Antioch (for he was ſent by both) replied, it was worſe than any that had preceded it, as it deſtroyed the incarnation.

In the ſecond ſeſſion Gregory of Neocæſarea, one of the moſt celebrated of the Iconoclaſts, and who had diſtinguiſhed himſelf the moſt in the preceding council, acknowledged his offence, and aſked pardon. The letter of the pope being then read, except a part in which he had complained of the aſſumption of the title of univerſal biſhop by the patriarch of Conſtantinople, and had aſked the reſtitution of the patrimony of his church, Taraſus ſaid he had expreſſed his own ſentiments. Images,

he ſaid, muſt be adored with a relative affection, reſerving to God alone the worſhip of *latreia*. All the biſhops preſent, to the number of two hundred and ſixty one, declared they entertained the ſame ſentiments, and the monks did the ſame.

At this council was read a diſcourſe attributed to Athanaſius, containing an account of a miracle wrought by an image of Chriſt, which had been pierced by ſome Jews, and from which had iſſued blood, which cured ſeveral ſick perſons. This piece is acknowledged by Fleury to be ſpurious, and the fact to be doubtful; but he maintains that this circumſtance did not invalidate the deciſion. He only remarks on this occaſion, that of ſo many biſhops none ſeem to have been verſed in criticiſm; for many ſpurious productions were cited; a proof, he ſays, of the ignorance of the age. But he muſt have been a bold man who, if he had entertained a doubt of the genuineneſs of thoſe writings, ſhould in that aſſembly have maintained his opinion.

In the fifth ſeſſion images were ordered to be replaced in the churches, and one being brought into the aſſembly, they all ſaluted it in form. They alſo directed that all books condemning the worſhip of them ſhould be burned.

In the ſixth ſeſſion, the council of A. D. 744 was condemned, as not having had the concurrence of the pope, or that of the patriarchs of Jeruſalem,

An-

Antioch, or Alexandria, and as having even been anathematized by the biſhops of thoſe churches.

In the ſeventh ſeſſion the members of this council drew up and ſigned a confeſſion of their faith, to the purport abovementioned, and it was ſigned by the legates, and all the biſhops, to the number of three hundred and five. They anathematized the council of Conſtantinople which had decided againſt the worſhip of images, and ſome of the Iconoclaſtic writers by name; and addreſſed a letter to the pope, informing him of what they had done.

The laſt ſeſſion of this council was held at Conſtantinople, when the empreſs Irene was preſent, with the emperor her ſon, and the confeſſion of faith was recited, and ſigned by them both. They concluded, as uſual, with loud acclamations, and the empreſs beſtowed great liberalities upon all the biſhops. And from her they were fully intitled to them.

In the canons of this council it was ordered, that no churches ſhould be conſecrated without relics.

Thus ſmoothly were all things conducted in favour of the worſhip of images in the Eaſt, and in Italy; but the caſe was different in the countries ſubject to Charlemagne, who is ſaid to have been diſſatisfied with the conduct of Irene, who had demanded his daughter for her ſon, and afterwards

married him to another. Whatever may be aſcribed to the influence of this political ſituation, when the pope ſent a copy of the decrees of the preceding council to Charlemagne, he aſſembled the biſhops of his extenſive dominions, none of whom had attended the council, and they drew up a long letter in the name of the king in ſeveral books, and thence called *Caroline books*, in which they expreſs their diſapprobation of both the councils which had been held on the ſubject of the worſhip of images, that of Conſtantinople, and that of Nice, recommending the uſe of images, but not for the purpoſe of adoration. They ſay they receive the ſix firſt councils, but that they reject all novelties, eſpecially the council which ordered the adoration of images, the acts of which they ſay were deſtitute both of eloquence and common ſenſe. The council of Nice, they ſay, cannot be allowed to be univerſal, becauſe there were not in it biſhops from all parts of the world, and becauſe its deciſions are not agreeable to the doctrine of the univerſal church. Alcuin, a learned Engliſhman employed by Charlemagne to teach the ſciences in France, alſo wrote againſt the decrees of the council of Nice, in a letter addreſſed to this prince, in the name of the biſhops and ſovereigns of England.

Charlemagne, not content with this, having called another council of all the ſtates ſubject to him

him at Frankfort A. D. 794, to ſettle various eccleſiaſtical matters, the adoration of images was then rejected unanimouſly, and great contempt of it expreſſed. Speaking of the council held by the Greeks on the ſubject, in the decrees of which it was ſaid that "whoever does not render to the images of Chriſt ſervice and adoration as to the divine trinity, let him be anathema," they ſay, We deſpiſe and reject this ſervice and adoration unanimouſly.

Notwithſtanding this harſh condemnation of the decrees of a council in which the pope concurred, Adrian, writing to Charlemagne, treated him with the greateſt reſpect. In juſtification of his own conduct he alleged chiefly two councils held at Rome againſt the Iconoclaſts in A. D. 732 and A. D. 769, in the laſt of which twelve biſhops from France aſſiſted, and when nevertheleſs it was agreed that images ſhould be honoured. He alſo quoted a paſſage from a letter of St. Gregory, where he ſays that images are uſeful for inſtruction, tho' God only is to be adored. He ſaid he received the canons of the council of Nice, becauſe they were agreeable to the opinion of pope Gregory, and becauſe he feared that if he did not receive them the Greeks would return to their errors, and he ſhould have been reſponſible for the loſs of many ſouls. Nevertheleſs he added that he had not then

given any anſwer to the emperor on the ſubject of the council, and that, if he thought proper, at the ſame time that he thanked the emperor for the reſtoration of images, he would preſs him on the ſubject of the reſtitution of the patrimony of his church; and that if he refuſed to make this reſtitution, he would declare him a heretic. Fleury ſays the pope had deferred ſending his letters to Conſtantinople on account of the uncertain ſtate of things there, and the great power of the Iconoclaſts. That they were ſtill very numerous there, appears from this circumſtance, that when the patriarch Taraſus had threatened the emperor with excommunication for divorcing his wife, and marrying another, he did not venture to provoke him ſo much, leſt he ſhould join the Iconoclaſts.

It is evident from theſe proceedings in the Weſt, that no idea was at this time entertained of the infallibility of the popes.

SECTION

SECTION IV.

Of the Controverſy occaſioned by the Opinion of Elipand of Toledo, and Felix of Urgela, concerning the Senſe in which Chriſt is the Son of God.

HITHERTO we have ſeen that all the controverſies concerning the perſon of Chriſt had their origin in the Eaſt. In this period one was ſtarted in the Weſt, and tho' the conſequences of it were not ſo great, or ſo laſting, as thoſe of the preceding ones on ſimilar ſubjects, they were by no means inconſiderable at the time.

In A. D. 790 Elipand biſhop of Toledo, conſulting Felix biſhop of Urgela in Catalonia, about the ſenſe in which Chriſt was the ſon of God, the latter anſwered, that he was his ſon by *adoption*, and not by *nature*; an opinion which was well received, and maintained, by Elipand, as it was by Aſcaric of Braga. It alſo ſpread much in the Aſturies, Gallicia, and the ſouthern provinces of France.

Pope Adrian hearing of this, wrote to the biſhops of Spain, exhorting them to adhere to the doctrine of the Fathers on the ſubject. On receiving this letter, Elipand called a council at Toledo, but neither the pope's letter, nor any thing

that paſſed there, led him to change his opinion, tho' oppoſed by Beatus, a prieſt and monk in the Aſturies, and Ethurius his diſciple, afterwards biſhop of Oſma, who recovered many who had embraced the opinion of Elipand. This, however, did not diſcourage the archbiſhop, and writing againſt his opponents, he ſaid that, they who hold that Chriſt was the adopted ſon of God according to his humanity only, and not according to his divinity alſo, were heretics. He ſaid that the three perſons in the trinity were God, the *principle* (αρχη) and the Holy ſpirit; and he compared their union to that of huſband and wife, which Fleury ſays was making it nothing more than of a moral nature, and that in other things he wrote like a Neſtorian. But the ſentiment expreſſed above is more nearly that of the proper Unitarians.

Charlemagne having extended his conqueſts into Spain, Urgela was in his dominions; and being informed of this new opinion, and, like all ſtateſmen, alarmed at any innovation, he called a council at Narbonne for ſeveral eccleſiaſtical matters, as he ſaid, but "principally on account of "the pernicious opinion of Felix of Urgela." What was at that time done in this buſineſs does not appear, but in another council held at Friuli the ſame year A. D. 791, the opinion of Felix and Elipand was condemned.

This

This ſentence, however, does not appear to have had any more effect than the letter of the pope; and the uneaſineſs of Charlemagne on the ſubject continuing, Felix was brought before him at Ratiſbon in A. D. 792. Being heard and anſwered in the preſence of the king, it is ſaid that he renounced his opinions; and being ſent to Rome, he confeſſed and abjured his hereſy, and then was permitted to return to Urgela. There, however, he maintained his former opinion; on which Alcuin addreſſed to him a letter of remonſtrance, and Felix replied. In this piece he ſaid that, ſince Chriſt, as a man, was the ſon of David, and the ſon of God, and it was impoſſible that the ſame perſon ſhould have two fathers by nature, one of them muſt be by nature, and the other by adoption. Jeſus Chriſt as man, he ſaid, was God only nominally, ſince Peter ſaid that "he wrought miracles becauſe God was with him, and Paul ſaid "that God was in Chriſt reconciling the world "unto himſelf. They do not ſay that Jeſus Chriſt "was God." Theſe, it is eaſy to perceive, are the ſentiments of one who was not far from pure unitarianiſm.

Both Paulinus patriarch of Aquileia, and Alcuin, by order of Charlemagne, wrote a large anſwer to this piece of Felix, and they charge him

with Neſtorianiſm, in making two ſons of God, one by nature, and the other by adoption.

Elipand appears to have been no leſs active than Felix in the defence of their common doctrine. He wrote a letter addreſſed to the biſhops of Spain, and another to Charlemagne, in ſupport of his opinion; and the letter was recited and ſeemingly with approbation, in a council which he aſſembled from the different provinces of Spain. This letter being read in the preſence of Charlemagne, he aroſe, and ſpoke a long time on the ſubject; ſaying that this error had excited great horror to the very extremity of his dominions, and that it was abſolutely neceſſary to put an end to it. The biſhops who were preſent aſked ſome days to give their opinion, and the king fixed a day on which they were to give it in writing. He alſo ſent an embaſſy to conſult the pope on the ſubject, and likewiſe ſent for learned men from Great Britain, in order to have the concurrence of all the weſtern churches.

The pope on the return of the embaſſy, ſent to Charlemagne a copy of the letter which he had addreſſed to the biſhops of Gallicia in Spain, in which he replied to the letter of Elipand, and exhorted them to return to the faith of the church, threatening them with excommunication if they did not. Paulinus alſo gave his opinion in a letter written

written not only in his own name, but alſo in that of the archbiſhop of Milan, and thoſe of all the provinces of Italy ſubject to Charlemagne.

This letter of Paulinus was read in the general council of all the countries ſubject to Charlemagne, held at Frankfort A. D. 794, when two legates of the pope attended. The letter of Elipand being then read to them, they anſwered it at large, in a ſynodical epiſtle, in the name of all the biſhops of Germany, Gaul, and Aquitain, addreſſed to all the biſhops and the faithful in Spain. It concluded, however, with a ſimple exhortation, without any threatening of anathema.

Charlemagne alſo wrote in his own name to Elipand, and the other biſhops of Spain, expreſſing his great concern for their ſubjection to the Infidels, but greater for their errors with reſpect to the faith; and after reciting all that had been done on the ſubject by himſelf, and the biſhops in his connection, he urges them in the moſt earneſt manner to embrace their faith, promiſing them in this caſe his aſſiſtance to deliver them from the infidels; but ſaying that, otherwiſe, he ſhould conſider them as abſolute heretics, and hold no communication with them. The effect of this letter is not known; but as Spain was not ſubject to Charlemagne, it was probably very little. It certainly did

did not encourage him to do any thing for their relief.

Felix of Urgela was in a different ſituation, being intirely in the power of Charlemagne. He having relapſed into his hereſy, as it was called, and replied to Alcuin, the king cauſed a council to be aſſembled at Rome in A. D. 799, when fifty-ſeven biſhops attended. In this council Felix was declared to be excommunicated, if he did not renounce his errors.

In the ſame year Charlemagne ſent a deputation of ſeveral biſhops, and other perſons of eminence, to perſuade Felix to renounce his opinions; and in conſequence of this he conſented to accompany the deputies to Charlemagne at Aix la Chapelle. There, after giving his reaſons for his opinions, in the preſence of the king, and of many biſhops and nobles aſſembled on the occaſion, and heard their replies, he did finally renounce, or feigned to renounce, his opinion. But on account of his frequent relapſes, he was depoſed and ſent to Lyons, where he paſſed the remainder of his days. This recantation was in the form of a letter addreſſed to the people of his dioceſe, exhorting them to join the univerſal church, and to ceaſe from the ſcandal which he had occaſioned.* In

* Claude of Turin was the diſciple of Felix of Urgel He was alive in A. D. 839, but his diſciples formed no ſeparate churches. *Robinson*, p. 448.

In A. D. 800, Charlemagne ſent a deputation of Archbiſhops, and other perſons of eminence, to Elipand, and they carried with them a treatiſe of Alcuin addreſſed to him, in which he exhorted him very earneſtly to follow the example of Felix. But Elipand, who was then in his ninety ſecond year, was not to be gained. Old as he was, he replied to Alcuin, reproaching him with the number and value of his church preferments; ſaying that he had not leſs than twenty thouſand ſerfs at his diſpoſal, lands being then given with the ſerfs or villeins who cultivated them. Thus ended this controverſy which does not appear to have had any effect after the age in which it aroſe.

SECTION V.

Of the Progreſs of Chriſtianity, and the State of Heathens, Jews, and Sectaries, in this Period.

ABOUT the year A. D. 637, chriſtianity was introduced into China by the Neſtorians, who were indefatigable in their labours for this purpoſe, when Jeſuabas of Gadala was at their head. *Moſheim*, vol. 2, p. 1. But it does not appear that any laſting effect was produced.

In

In the Weſt great progreſs was made in the converſion of the Germans by St. Winifred, to whom the pope gave the name of Boniface, a man devoted to the ſee of Rome, the intereſts of which he ſeems to have had at heart full as much as thoſe of chriſtianity.

The converſion of the heathens in the more remote parts of Europe was always attended to by the chriſtian powers, and eſpecially by the popes, whoſe power and revenue were much increaſed by its ſucceſs. Berin ſent by pope Honorius to convert the Pagans in England, made a convert of Coniſgiſle king of Weſſex, in A. D. 638. St. Wilfrid converted many of the people of Friſeland in in his way to Rome in A. D. 679. But the moſt ſucceſsful apoſtle in this age was Charlemagne, who propagated Chriſtianity as Mahomet did his religion, by the ſword. The great theatre of his exploits was in Saxony, then occupied by the pagans. Theſe he conquered no leſs than four times, and every time he compelled them to be baptiſed; but every time that they revolted, they never failed to apoſtatize from their profeſſion of chriſtianity. It was judged, however, that tho' the firſt who were converted in this way would be very imperfect chriſtians, their poſterity, inſtructed by chriſtian prieſts and monks, would be better, which certainly was the caſe.

How

How theſe new converts were inſtructed before they were admitted to baptiſm, will appear from the behaviour of Radbod king of Friſeland, who was converted, that is perſuaded to be baptized, by Wolfram from England in A. D. 719. When he had got one foot into the baptiſmal fount, he ſtopped to aſk where his anceſtors, who had died unbaptized, then were; and Wolfram replying that they were certainly in hell, he ſaid he choſe to go where they were, rather than with a ſmall number of poor people into the kingdom of heaven, and refuſed to proceed any farther. He added, I do "not believe theſe novelties, and had rather follow "the antient cuſtoms of my nation,"

Notwithſtanding the wonderfully rapid progreſs of chriſtianity, eſpecially within the bounds of the Roman empire, there were many remains of paganiſm, eſpecially in villages, and the more diſtant provinces, of which we find traces within this period. Many heathen ſuperſtitious cuſtoms were noted and cenſured by St. Eloi, who laboured much in the converſion of the people of Flanders about the year A. D. 640. The remains of paganiſm were forbidden in the council of Toledo in A. D. 694, and in council of Trullo at Conſtantinople in A. D. 692, eſpecially the invocation of Bacchus in the time of vintage.

We ſee as little of the true ſpirit of chriſtianity in

in the conduct of chriſtian princes and councils towards the *Jews* as towards the Heathens. At a council of Toledo in A. D. 633, it was ordered that the Jews ſhould not be compelled to become chriſtians, but that ſuch of them as had been made chriſtians by compulſion in the reign of Siſebat ſhould continue in the chriſtian faith, and that the children of all Jews ſhould be educated in chriſtian monaſteries, in order to their being inſtructed in the chriſtian religion. In another council at Toledo, in A. D. 694, the Jews of Spain, on pretence of their having conſpired againſt the ſtate, and againſt the chriſtians, were condemned to have their goods confiſcated, and be reduced to perpetual ſervitude, their maſters being charged not to permit the exerciſe of their religion, to ſend their children at the age of ſeven years to be educated by chriſtians, and that they ſhould be married to chriſtians.

The emperor Leo Iſauricus, at the beginning of his reign, compelled the Jews in his dominions to be baptized, but they waſhed themſelves immediately after, as if to efface their baptiſm, and, contrary to the cuſtom of chriſtians in thoſe times, they ate before they received the euchariſt. As many Jews pretended to be converted, and obſerved their own rites in private, it was ordered at the ſecond council of Nice, that they ſhould not be received to communion, and that their children ſhould not be

be baptized. They were alſo prohibited from purchaſing Chriſtian ſlaves.

The emperor Heraclius obliged the Jews to embrace Chriſtianity or leave his dominions, and he perſuaded Dagobert the king of France to do the ſame. *Sueur* A. D. 629. But the Jews had been as hoſtile to the Chriſtians, and whenever they had it in their power ſhewed an example of great cruelty. When Choſroes II of Perſia delivered his Chriſtian priſoners to the Jews, they put them to death, it is ſaid, to the number of forty-eight thouſand. *Baſnage* Vol. 8. p. 285.

In A. D. 722 there appeared among the Jews in Syria a pretended Meſſiah, and for ſome time he had many followers. *Sueur.*

The antient hereſies, as they were deemed, were not wholly extinct in this period. In the reign of Leo Iſauricus there were *Montaniſts*, who being ordered to join the Catholic church, rather choſe to burn themſelves in their churches. Grimoald king of the Lombards aboliſhed Arianiſm in his dominions, after which all Italy profeſſed the Catholic faith. *Giannone* Vol. 1. p. 226. On account of ſome remains of *Arianiſm* in Spain, Eugenius of Toledo wrote a treatiſe on the ſubject of the trinity, in A. D. 658. The hereſies of *Novatus*, and alſo that of *Jovinian*, who had diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the time of Jerom by oppoſing the

ſyſtem of monkery, were revived about the year A. D. 700 in the dioceſe of Clermont in France, and the monks of Monlieu wrote to refute them. The *Pelagians* were by no means extinct. The clergy of Rome writing to the Scots in Ireland in A. D. 640 reproved them for retaining the doctrine of Pelagius, maintaining that it was in the power of man, by his own will, and the grace of God, to live without ſin.

On the conqueſts of the Saracens the heretics of the Eaſt, who had been perſecuted, and kept under, by the power of the Greek emperors, held up their heads. The *Neſtorians* prevailed in Syria, and the *Eutychians* in Egypt. The Mahometans were more favourable to them than to thoſe who held with the emperors, or the popes of Rome, who were their enemies; ſo that from this time we have no certain account of the ſucceſſion of the Catholic biſhops in the great ſees of Jeruſalem, Antioch, or Alexandria. When the Saracens conquered Egypt, they protected Benyon the patriarch of the Jacobites, who had concealed himſelf ten years under the emperor Heraclius, and he entered Alexandria in triumph; and from this time there were two patriarchs of Alexandria, one of the Jacobites, and the other of the Melchites, ſo called as has been obſerved, from their holding with the Greek emperors.

The

The controverſy about the proper time for the celebration of Eaſter was kept up with great obſtinacy on both ſides in England; the antient Chriſtians in Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, maintaining the Jewiſh cuſtom, of obſerving it on the fourteenth day of the month, without any regard to its being ſunday, and the new converts from Rome the cuſtom that is now univerſally adopted in Europe, and thence called Catholic. Finan biſhop of Landisferne in Ireland held with the former, and one Romanus with the latter, as alſo Wilfrid, ſon of Oſwy king of Northumberland, who travelled to Rome, and on his return got the monaſtery of Rippon, from which the king ejected the monks, who preferred baniſhment to the obſervance of the new cuſtom.

In A. D. 664 king Oſwy appointed a ſolemn conference to be held on the ſubject at the monaſtery of Strenſhall, where Colman biſhop of Landisferne was the chief ſpeaker on the part of the Iriſh, and Wilfrid on that of the Romaniſts. In the iſſue both parties, as uſual on ſuch occaſions, retired with their former opinions, and the king was confirmed in his own.

In A. D. 669 Theodore was ſent by the pope to be biſhop of Canterbury, with the general ſuperintence of all the churches in England, accompanied by the abbot Adrian. He eſtabliſhed the

Roman cuſtom with reſpect to the obſervance of Eaſter. He alſo founded a celebrated ſchool of divinity, ſcience, and pſalmody, which from this time was introduced into all the churches in England. In A. D. 673 he held a council at Hertford, attended by four biſhops beſides himſelf, who all agreed to obſerve the Roman cuſtoms.

From this time the oppoſition to the Roman cuſtoms gradually ceaſed. About the year A. D. 710, the nation of the Picts renounced the ſchiſm, and conformed to the Roman cuſtom of keeping Eaſter, their king Naitan having adopted that meaſure. The monks of Ai conformed to it, and to eccleſiaſtical tonſure in A. D. 716. Of ſo much importance was this queſtion deemed, that no Britiſh or Iriſh prieſt could be reconciled to the Catholic church without a freſh impoſition of hands, and no private perſon could receive the chriſm (i. e. confirmation) or the euchariſt, till he conformed to it.

Such was the ſtate of hereſies and opinions of an older date in this period. Within it aroſe ſome that were new, beſides thoſe of Elipand and Felix, an account of which has been given before. About the middle of the eighth century ſome diſturbance was occaſioned by Adalbert in Gaul, and Clement a native of Ireland (*Moſheim* Vol. 2. p. 99.) who formed ſeparate ſocieties in Germany and France, inde-

independent of thoſe which were in communion with the church of Rome. Adalbert had adherents among ſome biſhops who in thoſe times were ordained without a view to any particular ſees, which was contrary to the canons. He is not charged with any irregularity of morals, but only with hypocritical auſterity. Clement rejected the authority of the canons, councils, and Fathers, allowed the marriage of a man with his brother's widow, and ſaid that Jeſus Chriſt when he went into hell ſaved all that were in a ſtate of damnation, even infidels and idolaters. He is alſo ſaid to have held ſome errors relating to predeſtination. On the whole, it is probable that, if the ſentiments and conduct of theſe two men were fully known, they would be ranked with the moſt early reformers.

Winfrid, or Boniface, the Romiſh apoſtle of the North, wrote about theſe men to pope Zachary, and alſo procured them to be apprehended. And in a council held at Rome in A. D. 748 (*Moſheim* Vol. 2. p. 100.) ſome very abſurd writings, ſaid to be theirs, were produced, and ordered to be burned, and their authors to be depoſed and anathematized, as alſo their followers if they perſiſted in their errors. After this the pope deſired that the cauſe of Adalbert, Clement and Godalface (whoſe name does not occur before) might be heard at a council in France; but what the following

proceedings were, or what became of the men, or their partiſans does not appear.

The falſe biſhops, as they were called, who were complained of at this time, were ſaid to be more numerous than the true ones. They are charged with being guilty of all kinds of crimes, and ſo were the primitive Chriſtians and the later reformers. They aſſembled people in the fields, and the houſes of the peaſants. They did not baptize with the ſign of the croſs, or the other forms of Catholic baptiſm. Theſe circumſtances ſufficiently ſhew why they were obnoxious to the popes and the Catholics. By the orders of the popes they were every where deprived of their prieſthood in provincial councils, and confined in monaſteries, i. e. impriſoned.

Among the novelties in this period it may deſerve to be mentioned, that a Scotch prieſt named Samſon, taught that men might be ſaved without baptiſm, by the mere impoſition of the hands of a biſhop.

The ſubject which afterwards became the diſtinguiſhing difference between the Greek and the Latin churches ſome times occurs within this period, but as yet no great ſtreſs was laid upon it. I mean the proceſſion of the Holy ſpirit, ſaid in the council of Conſtantinople to be from the Father. But he being ſaid in the Goſpels to be ſent

ſent by the Son, when this *proceſſion* came to be underſtood as relating to the *manner of his exiſtence*, and the Son was ſuppoſed to be God equal to the Father, and the ſame was affirmed of the Holy Spirit, it was thought by ſome that he ought to be conſidered as proceeding alike from both. This, however, was not mentioned in any public act till the year A. D. 447, where it occurs in the acts of a ſynod held in Spain. The ſame phraſe of the Holy Spirit "proceeding from the Father and "the Son" occurs in the acts of a council held at Toledo in A. D. 633.

It does appear that any complaint was made of this addition to the creed, (for in that it was inſerted) till the year A. D. 767, when the emperor Conſtantine ſent ambaſſadors to Pepin, who were heard at Gentilli near Paris. There the queſtion was agitated about the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father, or from the Father and the Son, and the Greeks complained of it as an innovation. But it does not appear that any thing was decided at this time on the ſubject. Indeed, neither the Greek nor the Latin church had any very ſettled opinion about it. For at the council in Trullo in A. D. 791, it was maintained that this proceſſion was from the Son, as well as from the Father. And pope Adrian, writing to Charlemagne, approved of the ſentiment of Taraſus pa-

triarch of Conſtantinople, who ſaid that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father *thro' the Son*, which, as Fleury ſays, ſhews that at that time the church of Rome did not reproach the Greeks on that ſubject.

SECTION VI.

Of the Power of the Popes, and of the Biſhops, in this Period.

IT was in this period of our hiſtory that the popes obtained the rank of temporal princes (tho' not yet abſolutely independent of a ſuperior) which they have held ever ſince; and the great wealth and temporal power acquired by the ſee of Rome was in all times that which emboldened them in their claims of ſpiritual uſurpation, and led the Chriſtian world to give way to them. In the former periods of our hiſtory the patrimony of St. Peter (as the lands and revenues of the ſee of Rome were called) had been immenſe, not having been confined to the territory of Rome, or Italy, but conſiſted of donations made from time to time in Sicily, and all parts of the Chriſtian world. But before this time they never received thoſe revenues of any place or territory which had before been

been at the diſpoſal of the prince, or emperor. But ſuch an acquiſition was now made by the popes in conſequence of their favouring the conqueſts of the kings of France in Italy, and ſuch was the influence of the popes at this time in all affairs temporal and ſpiritual, that it was of importance to the kings of France to purchaſe their alliance at almoſt any price. Beſides, they might imagine that, whatever they gave, they might hereafter, if they thought proper, reſume. The ſteps by which this great revolution in the ſtate of the Chriſtian world took place were as follows.

Gregory the third having taken the part of Traſimond duke of Spoleto againſt Luitprand king of the Lombards, and in conſequence of it Rome being beſieged by the latter, applied for help to Charles Martel, mayor of the palace in France, but in reality king of France in A. D. 741, promiſing that if he was relieved by him he would withdraw from the obedience of the Greek emperor, who had given him no aſſiſtance, and give him (Charles) the conſulſhip of Rome.

After this it was by the advice of pope Zachary that Pepin, who had ſucceeded Charles Martel, aſſumed the title of king of France, the pope, who was conſulted on the occaſion, ſaying that the title ſhould go with the power. In conſequence of this

Childeric III, a weak and contemptible prince, was confined in a monaſtery.

Again Rome being threatened by Aſtolphus king of the Lombards, pope Stephen II, having in vain invoked the aid of the emperor, and tried the effect of a ſolemn proceſſion, in which he walked barefoot, carrying an image of chriſt which was ſaid to have been made without hands, wrote to Pepin, and ſent the letter privately by a pilgrim; and in order to procure an interview, he deſired him to ſend embaſſadors to engage him to pay him a viſit in France. He then went to Pavia, and there applied to the king of the Lombards, to procure the reſtitution of Ravenna, and other places of the exarchate, which had been taken from the Greek emperors, who were ſtill ſovereigns of Rome. Not ſucceeding in this, he was permitted to go to France, the king of the Lombards, having no ſuſpicion of the buſineſs on which he went; and there he was received with the greateſt honor by Pepin and his court, in A. D. 754.

The pope having obtained the promiſe of the aſſiſtance he wanted from Pepin, they returned together, and Aſtolphus being beſieged in Pavia, promiſed to reſtore his conqueſts from the Romans. But on the return of Pepin to France, he not only refuſed to do this, but beſieged Rome itſelf. The pope, reduced to extremity, wrote to Pepin in the name

name of the apoſtle Peter, conjuring him in the moſt earneſt manner to come to his aſſiſtance, promiſing him all the good things of this life and another in caſe of his compliance, and threatening him with the torments of hell in caſe of his refuſal. On this Pepin came again, and beſieging Aſtolphus in Pavia, forced him to fulfill the terms of the treaty of the preceding year; and having thus obtained Ravenna, and the exarchate, including Pentapolis, or the March of Ancona (*Giannone* Vol. 1. p. 261.) a territory containing twenty-two cities, he gave them in perpetuity to St. Peter, that is, to the church of Rome and the popes. And this was the firſt foundation of their temporal power. But notwithſtanding this donation of Pepin, the popes continued to date their letters by the years of the emperors of Conſtantinople, and ſtill the ſenate and people of Rome called the pope their father, not their lord.

On the death of Carloman, one of the ſons of Pepin, and brother of Charles, who was afterwards, for his great exploits, ſurnamed Charles the Great, or Charlemagne (and who had a ſhare of the dominions of their father) his widow went with her two ſons to Deſiderius king of the Lombards, who requeſted the pope to come to Pavia, and conſecrate them kings of France, in oppoſition to Charlemagne, whom the peers of France had choſen for their

their ſole king, but he refuſed. On this Deſiderius approached Rome with an army, but on the remonſtrance of the pope he did not chuſe to enter the place by force. Charlemagne, however, coming to his aſſiſtance, beſieged the king of the Lombards in Pavia, and during the ſiege went to Rome, where he confirmed by his ſignature (for it is ſaid that at this time he could not write) the grant of his father Pepin, with the addition of Corſica, and beginning on the coaſtof Genoa, by the port of Spezia, extended his grant to Bargi, Reggio, and Mantua, comprehending the whole of the exarchate, the provinces of Venetia and Iſtria, with the dutchies of Spoleto and Beneventum. *Fleury* Vol. 9. p. 421. On the return of Charlemagne to Pavia, Deſiderius ſurrendered at diſcretion, and retired to the monaſtery of Corbie in France. On Charlemagne's third viſit to Rome, in A. D. 787, he added to his donation the cities he had taken from the duke of Beneventum, viz. Sora, Arces, Aquino, Arpi, Theano, and Capua. But the extent of the grants of both Pepin and Charlemagne are much diſputed by the adherents of the popes and of the emperors. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 69.

In order to induce Charlemagne to make this grant of territory it ſeems probable that the pope alleged the example of Conſtantine the great, who, it was pretended, had given the city and territory of

of Rome to pope Silveſter, tho' ſome ſay that this forgery was of a later date. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 72. Charlemagne, however, retained the ſovereignty of Rome, and probably of all the principalities that he had given him: for an oath of fealty was taken to him on the death of pope Adrian and the election of Leo III.

On Charlemagne's fourth viſit to Rome, in A. D. 800, the pope put a crown of great value on his head, and anointed him, giving him the titles of *emperor*, and *Auguſtus*, and after this the pope proſtrated himſelf before him, and acknowledged him his ſovereign. The people of Rome eaſily conſented to this tranſer of their allegiance from the emperors at Conſtantinople, as they had given them no aſſiſtance, and the empire was then in the hands of a woman, which, being a novelty, made the Romans aſhamed of their ſubjection. Thus the title of *emperor of the Weſt*, which had become extinct in A. D. 476, was reſtored after a lapſe of three hundred and four years; and from this time the popes dated their letters by the reign of Charlemagne.

One principal motive which induced Charlemagne to give ſo much power as he did to the clergy, and eſpecially to the biſhops of Rome, was that he expected more ſubmiſſion from them than from laymen; and that by their eccleſiaſtical power

power they would enable him to keep the others in ſubjection. Other princes acted upon the ſame principle, and were not altogether influenced by ſuperſtition. The exceſſive power of the clergy over the laity was confined to the Weſt, where excommunication by the Druids had always excluded thoſe who were ſubject to it from all the rights of ſociety, and even humanity, as we learn from Cæſar. Of this circumſtance the chriſtian clergy had availed themſelves to increaſe their own power.

In return for the temporal power which Charlemagne gave to the popes and the clergy, he aſſumed, and without oppoſition from them, much power of a ſpiritual nature. He not only retained the power of approving of the elections of the popes, which had been held by the emperors of the Eaſt, ſo that they could not be conſecrated without his conſent, but he regulated the churches by his *Capitularia*, calling ſynods by his own authority, in which both prelates and temporal princes were preſent, and in which rules were laid down for the diſcipline of the church, as well as for things of a temporal nature. Alſo, when any biſhops were preſented to him, and he thought proper to confirm the election, he inveſted them in their office by the delivery of the *Crozier and ring*, and after this the new biſhop was conſecrated by the

the neighbouring biſhops. *Giannone*, Vol. 1. p. 322.

In the hiſtory of this period, the popes advanced their pretenſions to power of various kinds. Of this the following are inſtances.

When St. Winfred, or as he was generally called Boniface, was ordained a biſhop by the pope, and ſent into ſome parts of Germany, he took an oath by which he bound himſelf always to act in concurrence with the pope, to hold no communion with thoſe who did not obſerve the canons, to hinder them all he could, or to acquaint the pope with their proceedings.

Gregory III ſending St. Willibald who was a monk, on a miſſion, he ſaid he muſt have the leave of his abbot, according to the rule of Benedict; but the pope replied "my orders are ſuffici-"ent, the abbot has no right to reſiſt me, if I were "to ſend himſelf." On this Willibald ſubmitted, offering to go wherever he ſhould ſend him.

Taſſilon duke of Bavaria not readily agreeing with Charlemagne, the pope declared him anathematized, if he did not abide by the oath he had taken, and ſaid that in this caſe the king would not be anſwerable for the murders committed, and other damages done, in Bavaria. This, ſays Fleury, is the firſt time that the pope pronounced upon the juſtneſs of any war. Vol. 9 p. 491.

A circumſtance which contributed very much to eſtabliſh the power of the popes in theſe dark ages, was the production of the *decretal epiſtles* of the antient popes, of which the firſt mention is made in this period. In A. D. 785, Ingelram, biſhop of Metz, drew up a collection of canons, and in them he inſerted ſome from the decretals, which Fleury ſays no perſon now doubts were forged by Iſidore Mercator of Spain, and which he ſays were calculated to advance the power of the popes, and of the clergy in general. Groſs as this impoſition was, it was admitted by all the Latin church eight hundred years, and was with difficulty abandoned by the Catholics even then.

Tho' thoſe decretals are uſually aſcribed to Iſidore of Seville in the ſixth century, Moſheim doubts their being ſo antient, and is rather of opinion that they were forged in a later period, not without the knowledge of the popes. Several of the more learned biſhops, eſpecially in France, were ſenſible of the impoſition, and refuſed to receive theſe decretals as the law of the church; but the authority of the popes, eſpecially of Nicolas I, reduced them to ſilence. The ſurname of *Mercator* added to Iſidore is, he ſays, a miſtake for *Peccator*, which it was cuſtomary for biſhops, by way of humility, to ſubjoin to their ſignatures. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 126. 127.

In

In one reſpect we find an inſtance of moderation in this holy ſee, that was not ſo common in later ages. Pope Zachary, writing to Boniface, diſclaims his having received any thing from thoſe biſhops to whom he had given the pallium. "Let "every one," ſays he, "who is ſo bold as to ſell "the gifts of the Holy Spirit, be anathema."

Some of the greater biſhops of Italy, as thoſe of Ravenna and Milan, when they were not under the ſame civil government with the city of Rome, were ſometimes induced to hold themſelves independent of the popes. Thus Maurus archbiſhop of Ravenna, being ſupported by the emperor Conſtans, would not receive the pallium from the pope, on which account the Romans conſidered thoſe who were ſubject to that ſee as heretics, and called them *Autocephali*. *Sueur* A. D. 649. In A. D. 979 Theodore the then biſhop of Ravenna was reconciled to the pope.

The popes did not gain ſo great an acceſſion of power in this period without the clergy in general, and the ſuperior clergy in particular, gaining ſomething in proportion.

At a council held at Ratiſbon in A. D. 807 the Choroepiſcopi were reduced to the condition of preſbyters. They continued, however, notwithſtanding this ordinance; and it was not till the

middle of the tenth century that they were intirely ſuppreſſed, both in the Eaſt and the Weſt.

It was the great wealth that gave the biſhops of the greater ſees ſo much power as to bear down the village biſhops, tho' none of them obtained the *principalities* which they did in a later period. Some inſtances, however, of the great wealth of clergymen occur in this. The caſe of Alcuin has been mentioned already. S. Wulfrid had ſo much ſecular power in conſequence of his immenſe wealth, the number of his monaſteries, the magnificence of his buildings, and the number of his vaſſals who attended him in complete armour, that the king took umbrage of it, and perſuaded the biſhop of Canterbury to depoſe him. This was in A. D. 678.

As the princes and the nobles aſſiſted at the councils which were held at this time, we the leſs wonder at the regulations of a civil nature that were ſometimes made in them. In a council at Toledo, in A. D. 633, ſeveral decrees were made with reſpect to the ſucceſſion to the kingdom, and the part which the clergy were to take in it, which, ſays Fleury, is the firſt time that biſhops took any part in civil government. At the ſixth council of Toledo, in A. D. 638, it was agreed with the conſent of the king Cinithila and the nobility, that no perſon ſhould aſcend the throne who would not promiſe

promiſe to preſerve the Catholic faith, and that if he violated his oath, he ſhould be condemned to eternal fire, with the biſhops and others who ſhould partake in his guilt. This, however, does not amount to the depoſition of the prince.

Such a diſpoſition, however, was ſhewn by the biſhops in theſe councils to control the ſovereigns, that thoſe of them who ſuſpected that they were not favoured by them took umbrage at ſuch aſſemblies of the clergy. Sigebert king of Auſtria wrote to Diſier biſhop of Cahors, to forbid his attending any council within his dominions, without his previous knowledge of it; ſaying he would never refuſe their aſſembling whenever he thought the good of the church, or of the ſtate, required it.

Marriage being conſidered as a religious engagement, as well as a civil contract, the clergy ſoon began to take cogniſance of it; and it evidently favoured their purpoſe to limit the degrees of affinity within which it might be lawfully contracted. Gregory III, writing to Boniface the biſhop of Germany, in A. D. 732, ſays that he ſhould forbid marriages to the ſeventh degree of relationſhip, and if poſſible, prevent men from marrying more than twice.

Not only were prieſts forbidden to marry, and the wives they had before receiving holy orders to have no commerce with them, but at a

council held in Rome in A. D. 720, an anathema was pronounced againſt any perſon who ſhould marry the widow of one who had been ordained a prieſt. At the ſame time they who married the wife of a brother or couſin were anathematized.

Godfathers and godmothers being conſidered as ſpiritual relations, the new laws of marriage were extended even to them. But theſe reſtrictions did not ſatisfy all perſons. Boniface, writing to the archbiſhop of Canterbury, inquires for the authority in the ſcriptures, or the canons of the church, for condemning the marriages of godfathers with the mother of the child, when ſhe was become a widow, which he ſaid the Romaniſts ſay deſerves capital puniſhment. "I do not compre-"hend," he adds, "how ſpritual relationſhip "ſhould render marriage criminal; ſince by bap-"tiſm we are all brethren." However when the pope was in France in A. D. 754, it was agreed that marriage with godmothers, either at baptiſm or confirmation (for they were then uſed at both theſe rites) ſhould be unlawful.

There was no prohibition of parents being ſponſors for their children till the time of Charlemagne, at the council of Mentz. *Bingham* Vol. 1. p. 513.

In A. D. 702 Witiza, king of Spain, declared it to be lawful for the clergy in his dominions to marry.

marry. This was reſented by the pope, who threatened that if the law was not abrogated, he would take his kingdom from him. But the king, in reply, ſaid he would pay him a viſit with his army, and chaſtiſe his inſolence, by plundering Rome, as his anceſtor Alaric had done. He alſo aſſembled a council at Toledo in A. D. 704, in which it was decreed that the biſhop of Rome had no authority in the Spaniſh church or ſtate. About twelve years after this Spain was conquered by the Moors. *Geddes's Tracts.* Vol. 2. p. 28. &c.

SECTION VII.

Of the Monks in this Period.

THE general ſituation of the monks continued to be nearly the ſame in this period as in the preceding; but there are ſeveral particulars in their hiſtory not undeſerving to be recorded. So much more ſtrict were the lives of the monks than that of the clergy, that the term *religious* became appropriated to them, as diſtinguiſhed from the regular clergy, who from living more in the world, obtained the epithet of *ſecular*. It appears, however, from the acts of the tenth council of Toledo, held A. D. 656, that at that time

the term *religious*, comprehended the clergy, as well as the monks.

In the time of Charlemagne it began to be the cuſtom to give lands in fee to churches and monaſteries. That of mount Caſſin was the firſt that got poſſeſſion of caſtles and baronies, whence its abbot boaſts of being the firſt baron in the kingdom of Naples. *Giannone* Vol. 1. p. 324.

In ſeveral reſpects the ſuperſtition of the times grew more favourable to the monkiſh ſyſtem than before. Whereas Baſil did not permit any perſons to take the vows under the age of ſeventeen, the council of Trullo in A. D. 692, permitted it at the age of ten, on the pretenſe that the church ſhould advance dayly towards perfection. By the third council of Saragoſſa, in the ſame year, the widows of kings were obliged to become nuns.

In A. D. 633 it was decreed in the fourth council of Toledo, that no monk, tho' made ſo by the devotion of his parents, ſhould ever return to ſecular life. *Bingham* p. 255.

In A. D. 694 abbeſſes, as well as abbots, ſubſcribed to the council of Becanfield in Kent, and before both preſbyters and temporal lords. This is the firſt time that ſuch a thing occurs in the hiſtory of the church. Ib. p. 259.

It is probable that there were many perſons who lived on pillars in the Eaſt within this period, tho'

tho' their names have not come down to us. For when, after the death of Tarafus in A. D. 806, Theodore adviſed the emperor Nicephorus to chuſe the moſt worthy to ſucceed him in the patriarchate of Conſtantinople, he wiſhed him to look out not only among biſhops and abbots, but alſo among the *ſtylites*, and the recluſe.

There occur many examples within this period of ſovereign princes renouncing their dignities, and confining themſelves in cloiſters. Coenred king of Mercia, after having reigned ſix years, went to Rome in A. D. 789, and there embraced the monaſtic life. Offa king of the Eaſt Saxons at the ſame time did the ſame, and tho' young he left his wife, his country, and kingdom together. Ceolulph king of Northumberland quitted his kingdom in A. D. 737 after he had reigned nine years, and he afterwards lived twenty-two years in a monaſtery. Carloman king of the Oriental Franks renounced the world in A. D. 747, leaving the government to his ſon Pepin. He received the monaſtic habit at the hands of the pope, and after paſſing ſome time in a monaſtery at Soracte, ſpent the remainder of his life at that of mount Caſſin, conforming to the moſt rigorous diſcipline of that place, ſometimes ſerving in the kitchen, keeping the ſheep, and working in the garden. Rachis

king of the Lombards retired to the ſame monaſtery in A. D. 750.

Sebbi king of Eſſex would have embraced the monaſtic life if he could have perſuaded his wife to do the ſame. When he was at the point of death, he received the monaſtic habit at the hands of the biſhop of London, and was the firſt inſtance, as Fleury ſays, that he finds of any perſon chuſing to die in this manner. In later times it was very common. Vol. 9. p. 6.

Vamba king of Spain, being to appearance at the point of death, in A. D. 680, put on the monaſtic habit, and recovering he was deemed incapable of the crown. The twelfth council of Toledo confirmed his reſignation, and the election of his ſucceſſor, declaring it to be unlawful for any perſon profeſſing himſelf a monk to take any military function, which was implied in that of a king. Vamba lived in a monaſtery ſeven years. This, ſays Fleury, is the firſt inſtance of the clergy abſolving any perſons from their oath of obedience to a temporal prince. Vol. 9. p. 62.

Exemptions of monaſteries from epiſcopal juriſdiction gained ſome ground in this period. In the formulary of Marculfus, publiſhed about the year A. D. 660, we ſee the beginning of it, the biſhop promiſing to give orders to any whom the abbot or the monks ſhould recommend, and not to

to enter the monaſtery but at the requeſt of the abbot. In A. D. 751 pope Zachary, at the requeſt of Boniface, granted an exemption to the monaſtery of Fulda from all epiſcopal juriſdiction, except that of the holy ſee. This, ſays Fleury, is the firſt example of this kind of exemption. Monaſteries founded by princes were independent of the biſhops of the dioceſe, and ſubject to no other inſpection than that of the king's chaplain.

In A. D. 785 pope Adrian granted to two monaſteries, one of St. Martin de Tours, and that of St. Denis near Paris, the privilege of having biſhops of their own. Other monaſteries had the ſame. Theſe biſhops were in general ſuch as, having quitted their preferments, had retired to theſe monaſteries, and ſome time they were village biſhops who had their reſidence in them. Sometimes the abbot himſelf was the biſhop, and ſometimes they were only prieſts who had the title of biſhops, becauſe they were ſent to preach in certain diſtricts.

In ſo high reputation were the auſterities of the monkiſh life at this time, and ſo diſſolute were the manners of many of the ſecular clergy, that a reformation for the promoting of piety and learning was much wanted. This was attempted, and in a great meaſure ſucceſsfully executed, by Chrodogand biſhop of Metz, in A. D. 763, who, in imi-

tation of Eusebius of Verceil, and Austin, formed a society of the clergy within his church, appointing revenues sufficient for their maintenance, and obliging them to live as much as possible for those who had clerical duty, according to the rules of Benedict.

He did not require absolute poverty of his *canons*, as those regular clergy were called, but that they should give all their property to the church of Metz, enjoying only the usufruct. They had the disposal of the alms that were given for masses, confession, and attendance upon the sick, if they were not given to the community. And this, says Fleury, is the first mention that is made of alms for masses, or any clerical duty. Those rules of Chrodogand were afterwards adopted in most cathedral churches, as those of Benedict were in the monasteries.

The rule of Chrodogand was condemned by Nicolas II in A. D. 1059 on account of its permitting the canons to enjoy the possessions they had before their vows, and its allowing them too large a portion of bread and wine. But the true reason was that it was instituted by the emperor, without the consent or knowledge of the pope. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 130.

We find great complaints of irregular monasteries in this period. It appears by the rules of Fructuo-

Fructuosus archbishop of Braga, for the monasteries in Spain, that there were what were called *false monasteries* in his time, erected by private persons on their own authority, who confined themselves to their country houses, with their wives, children, slaves, and neighbours, engaging by oath to live in common, but without rule, or superior. They were, it is said, interested people, who far from giving, plundered others on pretence of poverty. They were quarrelsome, and often called on their relations and friends to assist them with an armed force. Bede complains of such pretended monasteries in England during thirty years before he wrote. It is said there were also priests who, to get the reputation of piety, or to preserve their tithes and other perquisites, erected themselves into the superiors of monasteries without conforming to the monastic rules; and they received with open arms those who quitted other monasteries, the discipline of which they decried.

This account favours much of exaggeration. The persons here complained of might be disgusted with many things in the conduct of the generality of the monasteries of this time, and think they consulted their own improvement better by adopting rules of their own.

The monkish discipline being greatly relaxed, found an eminent restorer towards the close of this period

period in Benedict of Aniene in France, a perſon of Gothic extraction, and born about A. D. 750. His father, the count of Maquelone, placed him in the ſervice of king Pepin, and he was afterwards attached to Charlemagne; but becoming a monk at the abby of St. Seine, he diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo much by his voluntary auſterities, as to be cenſured and ridiculed by the other monks.

His only food was bread without any wine. He ſlept little, ſometimes on the bare ground, and often paſſed the night in the coldeſt weather with his feet uncovered, and was many days without ſpeaking a word. He wore the meaneſt dreſs, the holes in which he mended with cloth of any colour, and alſo bore the vermin with which it ſwarmed, ſo that he was conſidered by his fellow monks as a madman. The abbot endeavoured to prevail upon him to abate of his auſterities, but without effect. He ſaid the rules of Benedict were for the weak, whereas he aimed at greater perfection; but finding that he ſhould have few imitators on this rigid plan, he reverted to the obſervance of Benedict's rules.

On the death of the abbot he was choſen to ſucceed him, but there being too much difference between his manners and thoſe of the monks of this monaſtery, he retired to an eſtate of his own near a brook called Aniane in Aquitaine, where he founded

founded another monaſtery about the year A. D. 780; but the monks finding they were to receive their victuals by meaſure, many of them left him. A few, however, continued with him, tho' they had neither farm nor vineyard, cattle or horſes, but only an aſs to carry them when it was abſolutely neceſſary. Their numbers increaſing, they built a new monaſtery with their own hands, and covered it with thatch. Their ſacred veſſels were at firſt of wood, then of glaſs, and laſtly of tin. Afterwards Benedict admitted of ſome ornaments in his church, and many donations being made to this new monaſtery, he received the lands, but gave liberty to the ſerfs that were upon them, and never reclaimed any thing that was ſtolen from him.

The example of Benedict was followed by many other perſons; and being aſſiſted by dukes and counts, he began in A. D. 782 to build a church with more magnificence. He alſo rebuilt his cloiſter with pillars of marble, and taking down his thatched roof, he replaced it with one of tiles. All the decorations of his church were regulated by the number ſeven. He had ſeven chandeliers, with ſeven branches, ſeven lamps before the altar, &c. &c. But what he did of moſt value was collecting a great number of books, and he had among his monks grammarians, theologians, and perſons well

well acquainted with the ſcriptures, of whom ſome were afterwards biſhops.

Being in great favour with Charlemagne, Benedict received from him valuable preſents, which he diſtributed among various monaſteries, which he viſited with great aſſiduity, as their common parent. The monks under his immediate care being increaſed to three hundred, he erected a larger building, which afterwards ſerved for more than a thouſand, and in various places he eſtabliſhed ſmaller monaſteries dependent upon this, which were in later times called *priories*. His monks were ſent for to other monaſteries where the diſcipline was become relaxed, to ſerve for an example to them.

The emperor Lewis gave Benedict the ſuperintendance of all the monaſteries in his dominions, and with his aſſiſtance made new regulations for them all at Aix in A. D. 817. The principal cauſe of the relaxation of diſcipline then ſo much complained of was the obſervance of different rules in different monaſteries, pretending to be all of the order of Benedict; but now they were made exactly the ſame. Corporal puniſhment was allowed, but the monks were not to be whipped naked in the preſence of their brethren. Benedict died in A. D. 821, aged 70.

SECTION

SECTION VIII.

Of the diſorderly State of this Period.

SO great were the public violences and diſorders of every kind, in the courſe of this period, tho' they were exceeded in the ſubſequent ones, that to give a clearer idea of them, as far as eccleſiaſtical matters were affected by them, I ſhall collect the principal articles into a ſection by themſelves.

Exceſſive ſuperſtition, and great crimes, often go together, men having recourſe to the one as an atonement and compenſation for the other; and Chriſtian princes too often ſet the example of occaſionally plundering the wealth of churches, and monaſteries, as well as of beſtowing it. After the death of pope Honorius, and before the election of another, the emperor's officers plundered the treaſury of the church of Rome, and carried large ſums to Conſtantinople. The monaſtery of Mount Caſſin was intirely ruined by the Lombards, but reſtored by the orders of pope Gregory II in A. D. 718, one hundred and forty years after the devaſtation. Charles Martel often gave the goods of the church to laymen, for the aſſiſtance they gave him in the wars that he carried on againſt the

the Saracens. Boniface, the apoſtle of Germany, was much affected with the frequent inſtances of this uſurpation of the property of the church by laymen. Writing to Cuthbert, archbiſhop of Canterbury, he ſays, "Every layman, king, governor, or court, who takes a monaſtery by violence, withdrawing it from the eccleſiaſtical power, and ſubjecting the monks to himſelf, is called by the antient Fathers a raviſher, a ſacrilegious prince, and a murderer of the poor, deſerving of a terrible anathema before the tribunal of Jeſus Chriſt."

Writing to pope Zachary in A. D. 742, he ſays, "the greateſt part of the epiſcopal ſees in France are abandoned to laymen, debauched clergy, or public farmers. This had been the caſe" he ſays, "eighty years." He probably, however, referred to that part of France which bordered on Germany, where he reſided. He ſays, however, that there were biſhops and prieſts of the French nation plunged in adultery, and debauchery, as appears by the children they have had ſince their ordination. In the ſame year, however, a council was held in Germany for the purpoſe of correcting theſe abuſes, in conſequence of which pope Zachary addreſſed a letter to the French nation, in which he thanks God that he had expelled from them the falſe ſchiſmatical prieſts and concubinaries.

aries. But by the ſubſequent ſtate of things it too evidently appears that to order a thing to be done, and actually to do it, are very different.

Theſe diſorders, as appears by this account, were owing to the clergy themſelves, almoſt as much as to the laity. The greater clergy differed but little in their habits of living from the laity of equal wealth and power. During the troubles of France, the biſhops, and even ſome of thoſe who were the moſt eſteemed for their piety, took a great part in public affairs, and in time of war marched with bodies of armed men like other great lords. But in A. D. 803, when Charlemagne held a council at Worms, it was requeſted by the laity of all his ſtates, that the biſhops and prieſts might not go to the wars, ſeveral of them having been ſlain in battle, and much inconvenience of various kinds having ariſen from it. Accordingly it was ordered, that only two or three of the clergy, choſen by the reſt, ſhould attend the army, and that only to give the benediction, and for other ſpiritual functions.

The biſhops of theſe times not only took part in civil diſſentions, but ſometimes appeared in arms againſt their ſovereigns. When Wulfred was paſſing thro' France, he was met by one of the biſhops who had conſpired and killed king Dagobert, at the head of a great army, with a deſign

to ſeize him, and all his companions, to kill thoſe who ſhould make reſiſtance, to ſell others for ſlaves, and put Wulfred himſelf in priſon.

Some inſtances of open violences committed by clergymen of thoſe times, as well as thoſe in which they were the ſufferers, are ſhocking in the extreme. Tetricus, biſhop of Auxerre, was killed by his archdeacon while he ſlept. Lambert was biſhop of Maiſtrict when two brothers, Gallus and Riold, plundered the goods of his church, and became incorrigible in their violences. The friends and relations of this biſhop, provoked at this, killed them both. Theſe brothers were the relations of Dodon, a domeſtic of Pepin, mayor of the palace, who revenged their death upon the biſhop himſelf. He attacked him in his own houſe, and murdered him, and all the perſons he found in it. In A. D. 715 Savaric biſhop of Auxerre, attacked with an army the country of Orleans, Nevers, and ſeveral other places, and annexed them to his biſhopric.

It appears that ſome biſhops, to gratify their reſentment, cauſed the perſons whom they diſliked to be put to death privately, on pretence of ſubjecting them to penance. In the eleventh council of Toledo, it was therefore ordered, that all offenders ſhould be puniſhed in publick, or at leaſt in the preſence of two or three witneſſes, and that the

the ſentence be ſubſcribed by the biſhop. Biſhops, ſays Fleury, in thoſe times did condemn to ſuch puniſhments. Vol. 8. p. 548.

But the moſt brutal violences and cruelties that we meet with in this period were commit ed at Rome, on occaſion of the election of popes. After the death of pope Paul in A. D. 767, Conſtantine a layman was made pope, his brother duc Toton compelling three biſhops to give him holy orders, and conſecrate him biſhop of Rome, a dignity which he held thirteen months. But then he was expelled by force, his brother, and other partiſans, being overpowered by the help of the Lombards, and in the iſſue Stephen III was made pope.

As ſoon as he was elected, ſome of his partiſans took Theodore, a biſhop and vidame (Vice domini) of Conſtantine, put out his eyes, cut out his tongue, and ſhut him up in a monaſtery on mount Scaurus, where he was ſuffered to die of hunger and thirſt, calling for water with the moſt lamentable cries. They alſo put out the eyes of Poſſit, another of Conſtantine's friends, and confined him in the monaſtery of St. Silveſter, ſeizing the goods of them both. Conſtantine himſelf, after being treated with the greateſt indignity, being ſet on horſeback, with a woman's ſaddle, and with heavy weights to his feet, was conducted to the

monaſtery of Celles neuves. There he was ſolemnly degraded, his eyes put out, and left expoſed in the public ſtreet. The prieſt Valdepert had his eyes put out, and his tongue cut out, in ſo cruel a manner, that he died of the operation. After ſome time, a council was held at Rome, whither Conſtantine was brought; when, throwing himſelf on the ground, with his hands extended on the pavement, he confeſſed his fault with tears. The next day, when he was making his apology, he was driven out of the church with blows, and condemned to do penance all the reſt of his life.

The treatment of pope Leo III, whether he was guilty or innocent of the things laid to his charge, is another proof of the violence of theſe times. Having affronted one Paſcal, an officer of his court, the latter, accompanied by ſome of his friends, ſeized the pope in the midſt of a ſolemn proceſſion, and threw him on the ground. There they ſtripped him, tore his cloaths, and endeavoured to put out his eyes, and cut out his tongue. They left him, however, in the middle of the ſtreet, believing that they had made him both blind and dumb. Returning to him again, they dragged him into the church of a monaſtery, and before the altar again endeavoured to put out his eyes, and cut out his tongue. Then alſo they

left

left him weltering in blood, and confined him under a ſtrong guard in the ſame monaſtery. Fearing that his friends might reſcue him there, they conveyed him to another monaſtery, and kept him a cloſe priſoner. However, making his eſcape, he fled to Charlemagne, who was then in Saxony. Being well received by this prince, he returned to Rome with a great force, accompanied by commiſſioners from Charlemagne to inquire into the accuſations againſt him; and they, finding no proof of the things that were laid to his charge, ſeized his enemies, and ſent them to France. In A. D. 800 when Charlemagne came to Rome, the fourth time, the pope purged himſelf before him by taking a ſolemn oath that he was not guilty of the things of which he was accuſed, and this was deemed ſufficient for his juſtification. The emperor then heard Paſcal, and the other enemies of the pope, and condemned them to death; but the pope interceding for them, they were only baniſhed into France.

Ages of ſuperſtition are alſo times of other immoralities beſides open violence: for what vice is there for which ſome ſuperſtitious practice has not been thought an atonement. Boniface, writing to Ethelbald king of Mercia, reproves him for having no lawful wife, and debauching nuns. He adds, that the Engliſh nation were noted for their

debauchery in France and Italy. It was, he says, as a punishment for such vices as these, that Spain, Provence, and Burgundy, were abandoned to the Saracens. Writing to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, he complains that the honour of the British church suffered much in consequence of the frequent pilgrimages of nuns from England to Rome. Most of them, he says, lose their modesty. There are few cities in Lombardy or France, in which there are not some English prostitutes. It is a scandal, he adds, to the whole church.

SECTION IX.

Miscellaneous Articles.

I SHALL begin my account of miscellaneous articles that occur in this period with such as relate to churches, public worship, or discipline.

1. At the fourth council of Toledo, in A. D. 633, it was ordered that the same form of public worship should be observed thro' all Spain, lest, they say, there should be the appearance of *schism* in the church. Isidore bishop of Seville is considered as the author of the Mosarabic liturgy, and he directed all the proceedings of this council; but he says that his brother Leander took much pains with it.

At

At this council the Apocalyps was ordered to be read in the churches, ſome even then not acknowledging it to be a canonical book.

At a preceding council of Toledo, viz. A. D. 622, it was ordered that baptiſm ſhould be adminiſtered with one immerſion, leſt by three immerſions they ſhould imitate the Arians. It appears by the capitulary of Theodulph biſhop of Orleans in A. D. 785, that all children, even in caſe of ſickneſs, were baptized in churches, and not in private houſes. It appears by the ſame work, that the dead were forbidden to be buried in churches, it beginning then to be practiced.

Perſons employed in converting the people of Friſeland about A. D. 696, carried with them, beſides veſſels for the celebration of the euchariſt, a conſecrated table, which ſerved for an altar, which, ſays Fleury, is the firſt mention that is made of a portable altar. Vol. 9. p. 113.

2. Inſtances of the ſuperſtition of theſe times with reſpect to public worſhip, and every thing elſe, are without end, this being always in proportion to ignorance.

It being contrary to the canons to rebaptize any perſon who had been baptized, even by heretics, with the proper form of words, that is, *in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*. Boniface, ſo often mentioned in the hiſtory of this

period, when he was about to baptize any perſon with reſpect to whoſe previous baptiſm he had any doubt, ſaid, "I do not rebaptize thee, but, if "thou be not baptized, I baptize thee in the name "&c. &c." This, ſays Fleury, is the firſt inſtance of conditional baptiſm. Vol. 9. p. 246.

We ſee, however, ſome marks of good ſenſe in the directions of pope Zachary with reſpect to baptiſm. Two prieſts who travelled in Germany under the conduct of Boniface wrote to inform him of another prieſt, who, being ignorant of Latin, ſaid when he baptized any perſon, *baptizo te in nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spiritua Sancta,* inſtead of *Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti,* and Boniface was of opinion that ſuch perſons ought to be rebaptized; but the pope very ſenſibly obſerved, that it was a valid baptiſm, as there was no hereſy in the caſe, but only ignorance of the Latin tongue, and ſaid he was aſtoniſhed at the opinion of Boniface on the ſubject.

In the latter end of the ſixth century, women did not receive the communion bread with their naked hands, but with a fair linen cloth. Some think this cuſtom was as antient as the time of Auſtin. *Bingham* Vol. 1, p. 799.

It is well known that ſuperſtition found its way into the courts of juſtice of thoſe times; but one of the forms of it, mentioned in the capitulary of

of Charlemagne, is curious. In a caſe in which either of the parties might be perjured without diſcovery, they both ſtood with their arms extended upright before a croſs, and he, who could ſtand the longeſt in that poſture was deemed innocent.

It will be allowed to be an argument of the progreſs of ſuperſtition, and of a very hurtful kind, that pope Boniface V made churches places of refuge for all criminals. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 28.

Tho' marriage could not be deemed abſolutely unlawful, it was thought that there was a kind of pollution attending it; and according to the penitential of Theodore archbiſhop of Canterbury, a new married couple were not permitted to enter a church within a month of their marriage, and they underwent a penance of a fortnight before they were admitted to communion.

3. All Chriſtians for a long time refrained from eating blood, as they ſtill do except in theſe weſtern parts. But pope Adrian, in his letter to the biſhops of Spain, declares thoſe to be anathematized who ate pork. Pope Zachary writing to Boniface, the apoſtle of Germany, forbad the eating of the jay, the crow, the ſtork, and even the hare. *Sueur* A. D. 748.

4. Maſſes for the dead, and other ſources of gain to the prieſts, were greatly promoted by fabulous relations, to which perſons of piety, and even

of good ſenſe in other reſpects were too apt to give credit. Bede tells a ſtory of a young man who was taken priſoner, when a brother of his who was a prieſt, ſuppoſing him to be dead, uſed to ſay maſs for his ſoul, at a certain hour every day, and at that time he ſaid his bonds were always looſe. This being divulged excited many to get thoſe maſſes ſaid for them.

5. The ignorance of this age extended to the clergy as well as the laity, tho' not in the ſame degree. There was certainly more learning in the Eaſt than in the Weſt, and yet at the ſecond council of Nice in A. D. 787, it was thought neceſſary to order that every biſhop ſhould be required to know the pſalter, tho' by this was probably meant that he was to be able to repeat it, or ſome part of it, by heart. And the metropolitan was to examine him whether he was determined to read with aſſiduity the canons, the councils, and the ſcriptures.

Few of the clergy of this age being qualified to preach, Charlemagne engaged Paulus Diaconus, and Alcuin, to compoſe *homilies*, or diſcourſes on the goſpels and epiſtles, which were read in the public ſervices, and which the clergy were to commit to memory and repeat. This gave riſe to the famous collection which went by the name of the *homiliarium* of Charlemagne, and which has been follow-

followed by many other ſimilar works. *Moſheim* Vol. 2. p. 84. This prince directed the Roman ritual to be uſed in all his dominions. Ib.

Charlemagne, whatever his own education had been, endeavoured to provide a remedy for the ignorance of the age in which he lived. He brought perſons from Rome into France to teach all the ſciences, of which there was at that time any knowledge; and beſides eſtabliſhing ſchools within the precincts of his own palace, he appointed them in ſeveral cathedral churches and monaſteries. The perſon he chiefly employed in this buſineſs was Alcuin an Engliſhman, and by him Charles himſelf was inſtructed in ſeveral ſciences, eſpecially aſtronomy. He expreſſed himſelf with eaſe in ſeveral foreign languages. He ſpoke Latin as well as German, which was his native tongue, and he underſtood Greek, tho' he could not ſpeak it well.

It was but little however that was effected by theſe wellmeant eſtabliſhments of Charlemagne. All the literature of thoſe times lay in a very ſmall compaſs, and few were qualified to teach even that. The whole circle of ſciences was then divided into ſeven parts, viz. Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic, called the *trivium*, and Arithmetic, Muſic, Geometry, and Aſtronomy, called the *quadrivium*, and the manner of teaching had little

little to recommend it. They who wiſhed to purſue their ſtudies beyond the uſual bounds of this circle were adviſed to ſtudy the writings of Caſſiodorus, and Boethius. *Moſheim* Vol. 2. p. 57.

In the Eaſt John of Damaſcus was the moſt diſtinguiſhed for his learning and ability in this period. He is ſaid to have been the firſt who mixed the philoſophy of Ariſtotle with theology. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by compiling, regulating, and perhaps compoſing, chaunts for the Greek church, as pope Gregory had done for the Latin church. *Williams* p. 36.

6. The origin of country pariſhes in England was about the end of the ſeventh century. *Bingham* Vol. 1. p. 406.

PERIOD XVI.

FROM THE REESTABLISHMENT OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE IN A. D. 800 TO THE RAISING OF OTHO TO THE IMPERIAL THRONE A. D. 936.

SECTION I.

Of the Intercourſe between the Greek and Latin Churches on the Subject of the Patriarch Photius, which led to their final Separation from each other.

THERE had long ſubſiſted a jealouſy between the biſhops of Rome and the patriarchs of Conſtantinople, one the head of the Weſtern, and the other of the Eaſtern churches; and notwithſtanding the edict of Valentinian in favour of the biſhops of Rome, and their claim to ſupremacy, as ſucceſſors of the apoſtles Peter and Paul, the patriarchs of Conſtantinople, which from the time of Conſtantine had been the ſeat of the empire, ill brooked their inferiority; and being favoured by the emperors, aſſumed the ſuperintendency of thoſe provinces which were ſub-

ſubject to the Greeks, as Sicily, Illyricum, Dalmatia, &c. &c.

The biſhops of Rome, whom I ſhall now diſtinguiſh by the excluſive title of *Popes*, which gradually took place, having gained a great increaſe of wealth, power, and influence after Rome was no longer ſubject to the emperors of Conſtantinople, and eſpecially after they became temporal princes by the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne, were leſs than ever diſpoſed to yield to the pretenſions of the Eaſtern patriarchs, and were particularly careful to take advantage of any difficulties in which the Greek church was involved, and when appeals were made to them by the contending parties in it. This was more eſpecially the caſe on occaſion of the ſchiſm which took place in that church from the rival patriarchs Ignatius and Photius; and as the diſputes on this ſubject led to the total ſeparation of the two churches, I ſhall be the more particular in my narrative concerning it.

When this diſturbance commenced, Bardas, uncle of the emperor Michael, had the chief authority in Conſtantinople; and being reproved, and finally excommunicated, for his diſſolute life by the patriarch Ignatius, he contrived to make him ſuſpected of ſeditious intentions by the emperor, who in November A. D. 858 baniſhed him from Conſtantinople. The perſon choſen to ſucceed

ceed him was Photius, who was of an illuſtrious family, and related to the emperor, and more diſtinguiſhed for his abilities and learning than any perſon in that age, or ſeveral of the preceding. He was alſo grand nephew of the patriarch Taraſius; and tho' a layman, and having an office at court, he excelled in eccleſiaſtical as well as other branches of learning.

Bardas having determined to make him patriarch, found ſome difficulty in gaining the conſent of the biſhops, who were to ordain him; but on his promiſing to honour Ignatius as his father, and to do nothing without his approbation, they were all gained over except Metrophanes, the metropolitan of Smyrna; and from being a layman, he was in the ſpace of ſix days raiſed to the rank of a biſhop, and on Chriſtmas day A. D. 858 ordained patriarch of Conſtantinople. Two months, however, had not paſſed before he began to perſecute all who were attached to Ignatius; and aſſembling a council, he not only pronounced a ſentence of depoſition and anathema againſt Ignatius himſelf, but depoſed all who had been ordained by him. Ignatius was firſt loaded with chains, and then baniſhed to Mitylene in the iſle of Leſbos; but, as was too cuſtomary in caſe of ſuppoſed injuſtice, he ſought the protection of pope Nicolas, who, notwithſtanding the remonſtrance

of

of Photius, paſſed ſentence of depoſition againſt him, and all who had been ordained by him. He alſo ordered Ignatius to be reſtored, and that all who ſhould prevent it, of whatever rank (meaning the emperor himſelf) ſhould be excommunicated.

This conduct of the pope provoked the emperor to write to him in a haughty and menacing manner, and inſiſt upon his revoking the ſentence he had pronounced againſt Photius. Nicolas, who was one of the moſt violent men that had till then filled the papal chair, replied with no leſs warmth; and as the emperor had treated the ſee of Rome, as he thought, with diſreſpect, he magnified the prerogatives of it, as founded not upon councils, but on the words of Chriſt, and threatened him with excommunication if he did not attend to its admonitions. Photius, however, ſupported by the emperor, not only kept his ſee, but perſecuted all thoſe who ſeparated from his communion on that account; and hearing that the legates, whom the pope had ſent to Bulgaria, which had its firſt inſtruction in Chriſtianity from Conſtantinople, had rejected the conſecrated oil which he had ſent thither, he was ſo provoked, that, calling a council A. D. 866, in which the emperors Michael and Baſilius preſided, he accuſed the pope of many crimes, and pronounced a ſentence of depoſition againſt him. Among the crimes of the pope

pope he enumerates the difference of their cuſtom from thoſe of the Greek church, but lays the greateſt ſtreſs on the addition of the words *filioque* (*and from the Son*) to the creed.

Baſilius having murdered the emperor Michael, who was the friend of Photius, he was depoſed, and Ignatius replaced in the patriarchate; when in reſentment of the conduct of his rival, he not only pronounced a ſentence of depoſition againſt Photius, but againſt all who had been ordained by him, or who communicated with him. He, moreover, requeſted the emperor to call a general council, to remedy the ſcandal; in conſequence of which embaſſadors were immediately ſent to Rome for the purpoſe; and writing to the pope (who then was Adrian II) on the occaſion, he acknowledged his ſupremacy, and his authority to rectify all the diſorders of the church. This was ſufficient to gain his judges, and conſequently, in a council held at Rome A. D. 868, the council held by Photius was condemned, and the decrees of it ordered to be burned, and loaded with perpetual anathema. In this council, however, the temerity of Photius in condemning pope Nicolas being mentioned, the juſtice of his condemnation of pope Honorius for hereſy was expreſsly allowed. That in the following council for which the emperor and Ignatius had applied, every thing was as much pre-

judged as in all the preceding general councils, was evident from the pope requiring, by the legates he ſent to Conſtantinople on this occaſion, the abſolute condemnation of the council held by Photius, and the confirmation of that which he had held in oppoſition to it at Rome.

After this preparation, the *eighth general council*, as it is called, was held in the church of St. Sophia, on the fifth of October A. D. 869, the legates of the pope taking the chief ſeat. There were alſo perſons who repreſented the ſees of Jeruſalem and Antioch, but not that of Alexandria. Eleven of the principal officers of the court attended on the part of the emperor. Theſe being aſſembled, orders were firſt given to admit all thoſe biſhops who had ſuffered perſecution under Photius, who were twelve in number, ſo that this firſt ſeſſion conſiſted of no more than eighteen perſons. In this ſeſſion, however, a form of union between the Latin and Greek churches, preſented by the pope, was read, and the anathema againſt Photius, as an uſurper of the ſee of Conſtantinople, and alſo of the council held by him, was pronounced; and to theſe they all aſſented.

In the ſecond ſeſſion, held two days after, they who had acted in concert with Photius were admitted to the council, on acknowledging their offence. They were ten in all, and on their ſubſcribing

ſcribing the inſtrument from Rome were permitted to take their ſeats.

In the third ſeſſion there were in all twenty-four biſhops preſent, and ſome of the friends of Photius demanding to be heard, the legates from Rome ſaid that, if they came to hear the letter of pope Nicolas they ſhould be admitted, but not to diſpute. After much wrangling, however, and on the remonſtrance of the emperor's deputies, they were admitted; but refuſing to ſubſcribe the inſtrument from Rome, they were expelled the council.

Photius himſelf being compelled to attend, he behaved with great dignity, refuſing to make any anſwer to their interrogatories. On their calling him a prevaricator and adulterer, (meaning an uſurper of the ſee) he ſaid, "God hears me without my ſpeaking;" intimating that his appeal was to him, and not to them. On their ſaying that his ſilence ſhould not deliver him from their condemnation, he ſaid, "Neither did the ſilence "of Jeſus deliver him." Being urged to ſay that he ſubmitted to the ſentence of the pope, and acknowledged Ignatius for the patriarch, he ſtill kept ſilence; and being preſſed to ſay what was his juſtification, he replied, "My juſtification "is not of this world. If it was of this world, "you would ſee it." Being admoniſhed to take

time, and conſider his ſituation, he ſaid he did not require any time; but that, being in their power, they might do with him what they pleaſed. After this he was diſmiſſed. In the ſame ſeſſion the deputies from the ſees of Jeruſalem and Antioch ſaid that Photius had never been acknowledged by them as patriarch.

At the ſixth ſeſſion the emperor attended in perſon, when many of the biſhops of Photius's ordination, making their ſubmiſſion, were received. others alleging their promiſes, and the oaths they had taken never to do it, the legates from Rome ſaid they would abſolve them by the grace of Jeſus Chriſt, who had given them power to bind and to looſe, ſince they had done it by compulſion. Being urged by the emperor to ſpeak on their own behalf, they ſaid they would do it if they were at liberty, and eaſily ſhew that what had been advanced againſt them was nothing to the purpoſe. One of them ſaid that the canons were above pope Nicolas, and all the patriarchs, and mentioned ſeveral inſtances of biſhops being condemned, but not thoſe ordained by them. After much altercation the legates aſked whether they would ſubſcribe the inſtrument from Rome, and on their refuſing they were ſent to another part of the room. Metrophanes of Smyrna having replied to what they had ſaid, one of them was going to reply again,

but

but the legates would not ſuffer it. After this an exhortation to the ſchiſmatics was pronounced in the name of the emperor, who ſaid he would allow them ſeven days in which to make their ſubmiſſion, but that after this they would be judged by the council.

In the ſeventh ſeſſion the emperor attended, and Photius being introduced, leaning on a ſtaff, the pope's legates ordered it to be taken from him, as being an emblem of the paſtoral office, from which he was depoſed; ſaying that he was a wolf, and no ſhepherd. They then aſked him if he would ſign the inſtrument of his reſignation, but he replied that he was willing to give an account of his conduct to the emperor, but not to the pope's legates. Being aſked whether he had any thing more to ſay, he replied, "If you had heard what "I ſaid before, you would not have aſked me that "queſtion. If they repent of the ſentence they "have paſſed upon me, let them ſhew it by their "works." Being aſked in what manner, he ſaid, "let them do penance for the ſin they have com-"mitted." Being farther inſulted, he replied that he had nothing to anſwer to mere abuſe.

The biſhops of his party being then introduced, and required to ſubmit to the deciſion of the Roman pontiff, they all anſwered with great firmneſs. John biſhop of Heraclea ſaid, pointing to Photius,

tius, "Whoever ſhall anathematize that biſhop, let "him be anathema." Zacharias of Chalcedon ſaid, "We will not obey what is contrary to reaſon. "We ſee how things have been conducted." Euſchemon of Cæſarea in Cappadocia ſaid, "With "reſpect to what is contrary to reaſon, and the "canons, let it come from Rome, from Jeruſa-"lem, or any angel from heaven, I will not obey "it." Being aſked what they could ſay againſt the deciſion of all the patriarchal ſees, they ſaid, "The authority of the apoſtles and the councils. "We have demanded liberty to explain our con-"duct, but have not obtained it." Refuſing to ſubmit to the judgment of the council, an anathema was pronounced againſt Photius and all his adherents.

In the eighth ſeſſion they publickly burned all the ſubſcriptions in favour of Photius by biſhops or other perſons, together with all his writings againſt pope Nicolas, and the acts of his council againſt Ignatius. After this they who had been ſent by Photius to Rome, as legates from the other patriarchal ſees, being introduced, denied that they had any power to aſſume the character of legates, and pronounced an anathema againſt thoſe who had any concern in that embaſſy, or who had oppoſed pope Nicolas. The metropolitans alſo denied

nied their ſubſcription to the writing that was then ſent to Rome.

In the ninth ſeſſion a legate from the patriarch of Alexandria attended; but profeſſing his ignorance of the merits of the queſtion between the two patriarchs, he referred the deciſion to thoſe who were better qualified to judge. Being aſked whether he had been informed of what had been done in the eigth preceding ſeſſions, he ſaid that he had, and that he was ſatisfied with it. After this ſome perſons were examined who confeſſed that they had been forced to acknowledge Photius, and condemn Ignatius.

In the laſt ſeſſion, held February 12th A. D. 870, the emperor being preſent, ambaſſadors from the pope and the emperor of the Weſt intreated the ſuccour of Baſilius againſt the Saracens in Italy. An hundred biſhops were then preſent, and they recited and confirmed all that had been done in the preceding ſeſſions. Among other things, they decreed that they who had been anathematized in this council ſhould be forbidden to practice painting, or to teach the ſciences. The former reſpected Gregory of Syracuſe, who was a painter, and the ſecond Photius himſelf, who had taught with great reputation, and whoſe diſciples were much attached to him. They alſo decreed

that for the future no perſon ſhould publiſh any writings againſt the pope, as Photius had done.

After the canons of the council, they recited a confeſſion of faith, with anathemas againſt heretics, particularly the Monothelites, among whom pope Honorius was not forgotten, and alſo againſt the Iconoclaſts. They declared their approbation of the ſeven general councils, and called this the *eighth*. A ſpeech was then made in the name of the emperor, exhorting to peace and ſubmiſſion. In it he ſaid, "As to the laity, whatever be their "dignity, they muſt not diſpute about eccleſiaſtical "matters, ſince that belongs to the biſhops. "Whatever ſcience or virtue a layman be poſſeſſed "of, he is but one of the ſheep, and how little ſo-"ever be the merit of a biſhop, he is always the "ſhepherd, while he teaches the truth. Take care "then how you judge your judges, and live in "ſubjection to them."

The emperor then ſigned the decrees of the council after the legates from Rome, who did it with a reſervation for the ratification of the pope. The biſhops who attended never exceeded one hundred and two, the ſmallneſs of which number is accounted for by the many depoſitions made by Photius, and the ſees not having been ſupplied. It is ſaid that the decrees of this council were ſigned with ink mixed with wine from the euchariſt.

Among

Among the letters written in the name of this council was one in which was implied the ſubjection of the church of Conſtantinople to that of Rome. This the Greeks wiſhed to have withdrawn, and with the conſent of the emperor it was taken from the copies that were in the cuſtody of the legates. But the trick being diſcovered, and the emperor not chuſing to have an open quarrel with them, all the papers were reſtored.

Photius was far from being depreſſed by the decrees of this council, tho' in his confinement he was denied the uſe of books, and the attendance of a phyſician when he was ſick; on which he expoſtulated with the emperor, in a letter that he wrote to him. In his letters to his friends he repreſented himſelf as a perſon oppreſſed by power, as Jeſus Chriſt was before him, and exhorted them to ſubmit to the myſterious diſpenſations of providence. All his letters on this occaſion are written with peculiar ſpirit and dignity. In that to the emperor, in which he complains of his harſh treatment, unprecedented on ſuch occaſions, he aſked either relief from his miſery, or a ſpeedy death. In many of his letters he boaſts of the number and firmneſs of his friends, and that, in ſo great a ſtorm, not a ſingle biſhop, even of the moſt obſcure village, neither the learned nor the ignorant, had deſerted him. And in fact they were only a hundred

biſhops, all of whom had been ordained by Methodius or Ignatius, who had ſubſcribed to this council. All who had been ordained by Photius, and they were more than three hundred, ſtill adhered to him.

Notwithſtanding this ſeeming cordiality between the two churches, there remained a bone of contention between them in Bulgaria, the juriſdiction of which was claimed by them both. Pope John VIII even threatened Ignatius, tho' replaced on the ſee of Conſtantinople with the concurrence and aſſiſtance of his predeceſſors, that if he did not withdraw his biſhops and clergy from Bulgaria, and renounce all juriſdiction over it within two months, he would excommunicate and depoſe him. He alſo wrote to the king of Bulgaria in A. D. 879, exhorting him to return to the obedience of the ſee of Rome, and to receive a legate that he would ſend to him. At the ſame time he wrote to the clergy of Salonæ, that church being then vacant, and to the biſhops of Dalmatia, ordering them on pain of excommunication to ſend the perſon whom they ſhould chuſe for archbiſhop to receive conſecration and the pallium from him, without regard to the opinion of the Greeks.

Photius after being depoſed eight years contrived, as it is ſaid by means of forged books, containing a flattering genealogy of the emperor, to get

get into his favour, and attend his perſon. He was even permitted to reſume his epiſcopal functions, and ordained ſome perſons in the life time of Ignatius; and on his death, in A. D. 879, he was reinſtated in the dignity of patriarch; when he immediately employed his power in advancing his friends and depreſſing his enemies, reſtoring the biſhops who had been depoſed by Ignatius, and depoſing, or reordaining, thoſe who had been ordained by him. He even prevailed upon the legates, who had been ſent by the pope on the buſineſs of the Bulgarians, to communicate with him.

The ſituation of the pope himſelf was now ſuch as diſpoſed him to gratify the emperor, and conſequently Photius. He wanted the aid of the powers of the Eaſt for the relief of Italy, Rome itſelf being threatened by the Saracens. He therefore received in the moſt favourable manner the letters of Photius, and as Fleury ſays, againſt all the rules of diſcipline, and the example of his predeceſſors, conſented to acknowledge him as lawful patriarch of Conſtantinople, excuſing himſelf on the plea of neceſſity, and of his being received by the patriarchs of the other oriental ſees on condition that he ſhould aſk pardon in council, and reſign his pretenſions to the province of Bulgaria. On theſe terms he ſaid that, by the authority of the apoſtolic

ſee,

ſee, he would abſolve him from all eccleſiaſtical cenſures. In his inſtructions to the legates that he ſent to Conſtantinople, he bade them deliver his letters to "the moſt holy Photius," ſaying, "Pope "John our maſter ſalutes you, and wiſhes to have "you for a brother and a colleague." He alſo expreſſed his wiſh that the councils held againſt Photius under pope Adrian, as well that in Rome, or that in Conſtantinople, ſhould be declared null, and not be reckoned among the councils. This letter was likewiſe ſubſcribed by the biſhops who aſſiſted at the council in Rome.

After theſe preliminaries, Photius, being reinſtated in his dignity, ſummoned a council at Conſtantinople to meet in November A. D. 879, and it was attended by three hundred and eighty biſhops, the legate from the ſee of Jeruſalem, the two legates from Rome who had been ſent in the time of Ignatius, and cardinal Peter, who had brought the letters of the pope to Photius. After ſome others had ſpoken, this cardinal roſe, and ſaid, "Pope "John is willing to conſider Photius as a brother, "and as his own ſoul;" and then delivered the preſents which the pope had ſent, conſiſting of pontifical habits, a pallium, and ſandals, which the legates diſplayed before the council; and nothing was ſaid of the terms on which the pope had ſaid that he conſented to the reconciliation, viz. his aſking

asking pardon before the council; which, says Fleury, was apparently done with the consent of the legates, as they made no complaint on the subject. The pope's letters being read with this suppression, the cardinal said, "Do you receive these "letters?" They answered, "We receive all that "relates to the union with Photius, and the interest "of the church, but not that which relates to the "emperor, and his provinces;" meaning the claim of the pope to the superintendence of Bulgaria. The pope's letter to Photius being then read with the same suppression, he acknowledged that he was satisfied with it.

When the cardinal said that their instructions required them to demand the jurisdiction of Bulgaria, Photius replied, that he had always been a lover of peace, and that he had made no ordination in Bulgaria since his restoration. He added other things, but they were only general expressions, which did not bind him to any thing. In giving an account of his conduct with respect to the patriarchate, he declared that, from the beginning, it had been forced upon him; that when he was expelled he had yielded to the violence, without making any attempt to raise a sedition; that after his restoration to the favour of the emperor, he had lived on the best terms with Ignatius, had visited him in his sickness, and taken into his protection

tection the perſons he had recommended to him; and that after this it was at the preſſing requeſt of the emperor, and all the clergy, that he had reſumed his ſee. To all this the biſhops aſſembled in council unanimouſly declared that it was true.

In this ſeſſion, which was the ſecond, letters from the patriarchs of Alexandria, Jeruſalem, and Antioch, were read, all of them expreſſing their ſatisfaction in the reſtoration of Photius; and the perſons who had appeared as legates from thoſe ſees, at the preceding council were ſaid to have been perſons ſent by the Saracens, or with their conſent, to treat of the redemption of captives, and only pretended that they were legates. After reading the pope's letters abrogating the council againſt Photius, they ſaid, "We have already abrogated, "rejected, and anathematized that pretended coun-"cil, and we anathematize all who do not reject "it." "And how," ſaid Elias, the metropolitan of Martyropolis, and alſo Elias the legate from the ſee of Jeruſalem, "can that be called a coun-"cil, which has filled the church with ſo many "ſchiſms, where deputies from the Saracens ſat as "judges, the decrees of which are contrary to thoſe "of all other councils, which has condemned the "innocent without examination, and overturned "all laws eccleſiaſtical and civil."

In

In the fourth seſſion a legate from the patriarch of Antioch attended, with letters from him, and alſo from the new patriarch of Jeruſalem, the preceding having been dead, declaring that neither of them had had any thing to do with the proceedings againſt Photius. "We know," they ſaid, "that the ſees of the Eaſt have always acknowledged him." "This unanimity," ſaid Elias of Jeruſalem, "comes from heaven."

In this ſeſſion the different articles of the pope's demands being conſidered, they referred the buſineſs of Bulgaria to the emperor, and would not conſent to any obligation to raiſe none but of the clergy to the patriarchate; ſaying that this had never been a rule with the churches in the Eaſt. "We ought to be at liberty," they ſaid, "to follow our own peculiar cuſtoms, as the people "of Rome are to follow theirs." But they heartily concurred in condemning all that had been done or written againſt Photius, and in excommunicating all who would not acknowledge him. At the cloſe of this ſeſſion, at the propoſal of cardinal Peter, and as a token of their perfect harmony, the time for divine ſervice being near, they all received the euchariſt at the hands of Photius.

At the fifth ſeſſion, held in January A. D. 880, they voted the ſecond council of Nice to be the ſeventh œcumenical one, and pronounced an anathema

thema upon thoſe who did not acknowledge it to be ſuch. They alſo voted that all who were excommunicated by the pope ſhould be held excommunicated by Photius, and that all who were excommunicated by Photius ſhould be ſo by the pope.

Among the canons of this council, there was one to anathematize thoſe laymen who ſhould ſtrike or impriſon a biſhop.

In the ſixth ſeſſion the emperor himſelf preſided, and propoſed that they ſhould all agree in a confeſſion of faith; and they all conſented, even the legates from Rome, tho' it was made with a view to cenſure the addition of the words *filioque* to the creed. It was accordingly declared that they received the ſeven general councils, without taking from them, adding to them, or making any alterations in them; ſaying, "If any perſon "is ſo bold as to compoſe another confeſſion of "faith, or alter this by ſtrange words, additions, "or ſubtractions, we depoſe him if he be of the "clergy, and we anathematize him if he be a lay-"man." When they had done this, the emperor and his three ſons ſigned the decrees of the council.

The laſt ſeſſion of this council was held in the church of St. Sophia, on the 13th of March, when, after

after reciting every thing that had been agreed upon, the pope's legates said, "If any person do not "receive Photius as patriarch, and communicate "with him, let his lot be with Judas, and let him "not be acknowledged as a christian." They broke up with the usual acclamations, the last of which were, "long life to the patriarch Photius, and "to John."

After this the pope, writing to Photius on the subject of the addition to the creed, said that he considered it in the same light that he did, viz. as a corruption of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, but he wished not to compel any person to abandon that addition if they had been used to make it, but to use mildness and address, exhorting them by degrees to renounce that blasphemy. Indeed, this addition, as has been observed, had not its origin at Rome, but in the churches of Spain.

As to the facility with which the bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, took their part for or against Photius, Fleury says it may be easily accounted for from their poverty and abject condition; being ready to join with any who, having the most power, had the most to give. But certainly the history of these two councils proves the same with respect to the bishops in general, and all the councils which were composed of them.

The pope, on receiving the decrees of this council, approved of them; and writing to the emperor, thanked him for the ſuccour which he had given him againſt the Saracens, and his ſurrender of the juriſdiction of Bulgaria; hoping, as may be ſuppoſed, that he would make no difficulty of it. He added, "We receive the council of Conſtantinople for the reſtoration of Photius to the patriarchate; but if our legates have done any thing contrary to our orders, we do not receive it."

The hiſtory of this affair is certainly no argument for the infallibity of the Roman pontifs, and much leſs is what preſently followed what I have recited. For pope Martin and Adrian III, finding that the emperor and Photius did not intend to give up the juriſdiction of Bulgaria, not thinking themſelves obliged to confirm what had been done by their predeceſſors, condemned Photius as an intruder; and in return he wrote a violent letter againſt the Latins on the ſubject of the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit; ſaying that both pope Leo the Great, and Leo III held this proceſſion to be from the Father only. The emperor, offended at the conduct of thoſe popes, wrote a provoking letter addreſſed to Adrian, but received by Stephen who had ſucceeded him. He replied to it, and ſaid that the city of Conſtantinople was without

without a patriarch; conſidering Photius as an uſurper, notwithſtanding his ſolemn reſtoration with the hearty concurrence of his predeceſſors.

There was not, however, any more uniformity of conduct in the Eaſt than in the Weſt. For Leo VI, ſurnamed *the Philoſopher*, ſucceeding his father Baſilius, in the firſt year of his reign baniſhed Photius, and ſent him to a monaſtery in Armenia, where he ſoon after died. The cauſe of this was that the emperor ſuſpected him of a deſign to raiſe a relation of his own to the empire. Tho', however, he concurred with the pope in his condemnation of Photius, he wrote to him to requeſt that he would reſtore thoſe of the clergy who had been ordained by Photius. In anſwer to this, pope Formoſus ſaid he would pardon them on their repentance, but that they ſhould only be conſidered as laymen. It does not appear that any thing was done in conſequence of this; and from this time the two churches had but little intercourſe; tho' at a council held at Conſtantinople, in A. D. 920, in which four h marriages were condemned, the emperor Conſtantine Porphyroganita ſent to the pope to requeſt the concurrence of the Latin church, and renew the intercourſe that had formerly ſubſiſted between them, and which he ſaid had been unhappily interrupted.

It may not be improper, before I close this subject, to mention all the points of difference between the Greek and Latin churches, as they are enumerated by Photius, and shew the stress that he laid upon them. In the first place, he says, "they "fast on saturdays, tho' the least contempt of the "traditions tends to overturn all religion. More- "over, they take from Lent the first week, per- "mitting to eat milk, meat, and cheese in it. "Following the errors of Manes, they have an "aversion to priests engaged in lawful marriage. "They repeat the unction of chrism when it has "been administered by priests; saying that bishops "only are empowered to administer it. But the "height of their impiety is their daring to add new "words to the sacred symbol, authorized by all "the councils, saying that the Holy Spirit does "not proceed from the Father only, but also from "the Son. After this," he says, "it is in "vain to pretend to be Christians. This, is "admitting *two principles* in the trinity, and "confounding the properties of the divine persons." *Fleury* Vol. II. p. 133.

Pope Nicolas having received a letter from Photius, containing these accusations of the Latin church, communicated it to Hincmar, the learned archbishop of Rheims; and he required the bishops who were under him to write their thoughts on the sub-

ſubjects, and there are now extant two of thoſe treatiſes, one written by Eneas biſhop of Paris, and the other by Ratram a monk of Corbie. In this work Ratram ſays, "If by the Holy Spirit being "ſent by the Son, a *proceſſion* be not meant, it "muſt be a *ſervice*, and then the Holy Spirit will "be inferior to the Son, which is Arianiſm. What," ſays he, "is it that the Holy Spirit can take from "the Son, if it be not his ſubſtance?"

This, however, was not the firſt time that this curious queſtion was conſidered in the Latin church. In A. D. 809, in a council held at Aix la Chapelle in the preſence of Charlemagne, this queſtion about the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit was formally diſcuſſed; and in order to have it decided this emperor ſent an embaſſy to pope Leo, with a treatiſe written by Smaragdus abbot of St. Michael, to prove the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit to be from the Son, as well as from the Father. To this doctrine the pope gave his aſſent. But when he was farther urged to ſay whether a man who did not believe it could be ſaved, he ſeemed unwilling to go ſo far; but acknowledged that if a man could underſtand it, and would not believe it, he could not be ſaved. He would not, however, allow any new clauſe to be added to the creed. Notwithſtanding this, in France and Spain,

the creed was read with this addition, and in Rome without it.

SECTION II.

The Sequel of the Hiſtory of Image-worſhip.

THERE is hardly any thing in the whole compaſs of church hiſtory that demonſtrates more clearly the deciſive influence of the imperial authority in eccleſiaſtical matters, than the whole of this controverſy relating to the worſhip of images; the decrees of the church conſtantly changing with the diſpoſition of the court. In the time of Irene the worſhip of images was moſt ſolemnly eſtabliſhed. But Nicephorus, who depoſed and baniſhed her, was no friend to that ſuperſtition, tho' he did not chuſe to do any thing with reſpect to it. His ſucceſſor Michael Curopolates favoured the worſhip of images, and perſecuted thoſe who oppoſed it.

On the contrary, Leo the Armenian was a violent Iconoclaſt, and conſidered the ſubjection of the Chriſtians to the Saracens as owing to their ſuperſtition and the idolatry of image worſhip, and ſaid that all the preceding emperors, who were of that ſect, had died violent deaths; but the reſt peace-

peaceably in their beds. He had, however, much oppoſition from the patriarch Nicephorus, and the monks; and tho' he had a conference with them on the ſubject, it was to no purpoſe. Nicephorus, not yielding to the emperor, found himſelf obliged to abdicate the patriarchate, and he was conducted to a monaſtery. Theodorus who ſucceeded him was an iconoclaſt like the emperor, and conſequently the images were every where demoliſhed. In oppoſition to this, Theodore Studites, at the head of his monks, carried them in a ſolemn proceſſion on a Whitſunday, ſinging hymns in honour of them. Being invited to attend a council which the emperor called, he refuſed to go, knowing the deſign of it, and remonſtrated againſt it.

The firſt thing that was done in this council was to confirm that which had been held by Conſtantine Copronymus againſt the worſhip of images, and to anathematize the ſubſequent one of Nice. This was done with perfect unanimity by all who attended; but ſome biſhops and abbots being introduced, and refuſing to conſent to what had been done, they were inſulted, and ſent to priſon; and the council was cloſed with acclamations in the uſual manner.

Agreeable to the orders of this council, images were again removed from the churches, and among

the many abbots and others who were baniſhed for adhering to the late doctrine, Theodore Studites was not forgotten. He was ſent to the caſtle of Metopus near Apollonia, where he continued to write and encourage his friends.

In this perſecution of the worſhippers of images, Nicetas and Theodore Studita, were not to be moved by the harſheſt treatment, nor could they be prevailed upon to communicate with the Iconoclaſts. Theodore applied to the pope, imploring his aſſiſtance. He alſo wrote very moving letters to the patriarchs of Jeruſalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, begging their prayers, and their compaſſion. The patriarch of Jeruſalem ſent two monks to Conſtantinople; but on their remonſtrating with too much freedom to the emperor, they were baniſhed to the mouth of the Danube. Pope Paſcal ſent letters and a legate to Conſtantinople, but without any effect. However, he provided a monaſtery for the Greek refugees at Rome.

The ſtreſs which theſe rigid adherents to the worſhip of images laid on their doctrine and practice appears, at this diſtance of time, not a little extraordinary; but our ſurprize is leſſened by the conſideration that they wrote, in a time of perſecution, and conſequently of great irritation. Theodore Studita, writing about the reception of penitents, ſays, "they were to be received not as

"thoſe

" thoſe who had fallen into a hereſy, but as thoſe " who had denied Chriſt; for, as Baſil ſays, the " renouncing of the images, goes to the original. " It is not lawful," he ſays, " to eat with the he- " retics, not even in caſe of neceſſity, nor with the " Catholics themſelves who communicate with " them except once or twice, and that through " neceſſity. It is not lawful," he ſays, " to ſalute " heretics, or receive their gifts."

This perſecution ended with the life of the emperor Leo, and the acceſſion of Michael the Stammerer, in A. D. 820. Michael recalled the exiles, and tho' no worſhipper of images himſelf, he allowed other perſons to do as they thought proper in that reſpect. This emperor, preſſed by his enemies, and fearing leſt the worſhippers of images ſhould turn againſt him, propoſed a conference between the two parties. But Theodore and his brethren abſolutely refuſed it; ſaying, it belonged to the biſhops of the apoſtolic ſees, the chief of which was that of Rome, to decide concerning the faith.

After the civil war, in which Michael was engaged, was over, this emperor ſent embaſſadors to Lewis the Weſtern emperor, giving him an account of the worſhip of images in the Eaſt, particularly complaining of ſome groſs and ridiculous ſuperſtitions which he ſaid had induced him, and

other emperors, to remove the images from a lower to a higher ſituation in the churches, where they might ſerve for the inſtruction of the people, without being the objects of ſuch abuſe. "They re- "moved the croſſes," he ſays, "from the churches, "and put images in their places; and before theſe "images they lighted lamps, and burned incenſe, "paying them honour as to the croſſes. They "alſo ſing hymns before theſe images, adore them, "and implore their aſſiſtance. Several perſons "put clothes upon them, and make them god- "fathers and godmothers to their children; they "put upon them the firſt hair they cut from their "heads, or offer their hair to them when they take "the monaſtic habit. Some prieſts ſcrape colours "from the pictures, and mix them with the elements "of the euchariſt, or firſt put the elements into "the hands of the images, and then give them in- "to the hands of the communicants; and others "take boards on which are the pictures of ſome "ſaints, and make uſe of them for altars in private "houſes." This letter ſhews the good ſenſe of the emperor, as well as the ridiculous folly of the times, which, without hiſtorical evidence, would indeed be incredible.

On receiving this letter Lewis applied to the pope, requeſting that an aſſembly of biſhops might reexamine the buſineſs of images; and the pope, who

who was then Eugenius, conſenting, ſeveral biſhops were ordered to meet at Paris in November A. D. 825, none being abſent but the biſhop of Autun, who was detained by illneſs. In this aſſembly, after reading the letter of pope Adrian to Conſtantine and Irene, the Caroline books, and Adrian's anſwer to them, which they did not think ſatisfactory, they came to a reſolution ſimilar to that of the council of Frankfort, approving of the uſe of images, but not for the purpoſe of adoration.

From this council a deputation was ſent to the pope with the approbation of Lewis, requeſting his interference to compoſe the differences in the Eaſt, by bringing the two oppoſite parties to the medium which themſelves obſerved. Agobard biſhop of Lyons was the moſt diſtinguiſhed of thoſe biſhops, and is ſuppoſed to have drawn up the letter to the pope, and others that were written on this occaſion. What effect this deputation had does not appear. But it is certain, Fleury ſays, that the Gallican church continued to think and act as they then did a long time, and yet were in communion with the church of Rome. Political and intereſted conſiderations did not operate ſo powerfully in the Weſt on this occaſion as they did in the Eaſt, and the minds of men had never been ſo much irritated on the ſubject.

There

There was, however, ſome conſiderable difference of opinion on this ſubject even in the Weſt, where the perſon who diſtinguiſhed himſelf the moſt by his oppoſition to the worſhip of images, and other abuſes of the times, was Claudius biſhop of Turin, a diſciple of Felix of Urgela. He had been a prieſt in the palace of the emperor Lewis, where he ſerved with great reputation, and was particularly eminent for his knowledge of the ſcriptures, on many parts of which he wrote commentaries. The emperor, ſeeing that the people of Italy were very ignorant, ſent Claudius to inſtruct them; and he, obſerving that the people paid a ſuperſtitious reſpect to images, removed them, and alſo all the croſſes that had been erected in his diocese. He ſaid, in defence of his conduct, that "when the Pagans transferred their worſhip from "the images of their gods to thoſe of the ſaints, "they only changed the names of things, but did "not abandon the worſhip of idols, ſo that they "were ſtill *idolaters*; and if men muſt be adored, "it were better to worſhip living men than dead "ones, as they bore a greater reſemblance to God." He ſaid that, "if the croſs was to be worſhipped "becauſe Chriſt hung upon it, every thing alſo "that bore as near a relation to him was to be "adored, as the manger in which he had lain, the "the aſs on which he rode, the thorns and the

"lance

"lance which were the inſtruments of his paſ-
"ſion, &c." However, in what he publiſhed on this ſubject he was anſwered by Dungal of St. Denis in France, but what effect the controverſy had does not appear.

Claudius was not content with reforming the the abuſe of the adoration of images. In the litany, and other offices of the church, he made no mention of any of the ſaints, and did not celebrate their feſtivals. He forbade the lighting of candles in the churches in the day time. He alſo declined attending the uſual councils of biſhops, ſaying they were the aſſemblies of aſſes. His anſwerer, however, ſaid that they ought not to be ſo patient, or to ſpare ſuch a perſon. The emperor was not altogether pleaſed with the writings of Claudius on thoſe ſubjects, and by his direction Jonas biſhop of Orleans, was employed in this work, when he heard that Claudius was dead.

This eminent reformer left diſciples, and it appeared that, beſides his zeal againſt the worſhip of images, and other ſuperſtitious practices, he is ſaid to have revived the ſyſtem of Arianiſm, or unitarianiſm, and to have left writings on this ſubject in the epiſcopal palace. But it does not appear that they were ever publiſhed. The anſwer of Jonas is confined to the article of images, the worſhip of which he diſclaims, tho' he ſaid that they who prayed before

them

them in their honour ought not to be treated as idolators.

Theophilus, who ſucceeded his father Michael in A. D. 829, ſoon diſcovered even more zeal againſt the worſhippers of images than his father had done. He not only forbade the worſhip of images, but even the making, or keeping of them, and the priſons were full of painters, monks, and biſhops. He had a particular diſlike of the monks, and forbade them going into cities, or even being ſeen in the open fields. Notwithſtanding this, his wife Theodora, and his mother in law, continued zealous for the worſhip of images.

This emperor was particularly deſirous of gaining Theodore of Jeruſalem, and his brother Theophanes, who had been ill uſed and baniſhed by his father; and for this purpoſe he ſent for them in A. D. 833. But not ſucceeding, they were groſsly inſulted, having, it is ſaid, ſome verſes inſcribed on their faces, and were remanded to their place of baniſhment. They were offered their liberty if they would communicate, tho' but once, with the other party; but they reſolutely refuſed, ſaying it was as if they ſhould be deſired to cut off their heads only once, and that then they might go where they pleaſed. Methodius had much better treatment, the emperor not only taking him out of priſon, but keeping him about his perſon, and taking

taking him with him in his warlike expeditions; but it was ſaid that he was apprehenſive of his promoting a revolt of the common people if he was left behind. This, however, might have been prevented by his being left in priſon.

On the death of Theophilus, his ſon Michael being an infant, the empreſs Theodora governed in his name, and being a zealous advocate for the worſhip of images, ſhe ſignified to the patriarch John, that he muſt either aſſiſt her in reſtoring them, or be expelled from his ſee. Not complying with her wiſhes, he was depoſed, and confined to his country houſe.

A council being then called, the Iconoclaſts were again anathematized, the ſecond council of Nice confirmed, and Methodius was made patriarch of Conſtantinople. After this, the images were immediately replaced in the church of St. Sophia, and every where elſe. And to complete the buſineſs, the empreſs made a feaſt for the clergy, and others who had ſuffered in the late perſecution, and continued it annually as long as ſhe lived, calling it *the feaſt of orthodoxy*; and it is ſtill celebrated in the Greek church. Thus ended, ſay the Catholics, the hereſy of the *Iconoclaſts*, after about one hundred and twenty years from its introduction by the emperor Leo Iſauricus.

The

The Iconoclaſts were not, however, yet wholly ſilenced; and at the eighth general council, held by Baſilius in A. D. 869, after the buſineſs of Photius and Ignatius was diſpatched, Theodore Crithin, the chief of the Iconoclaſts, was introduced; and being required to ſubmit to the decrees of the church, expreſſed by the patriarchs of the five apoſtolic ſees, he replied with great firmneſs, after acknowledging his reſpect for the image of the emperor which was ſhewn him, that he would not worſhip the image of Chriſt unleſs they could ſhew him that Chriſt required it. Others, however, of that party confeſſed their error, as it was called, and were received into the church.

SECTION III.

Of the Controverſy occaſioned by Goteſchalchus concerning Predeſtination.

THE doctrine of *predeſtination* was firſt advanced by Auſtin, in purſuance of what he had maintained in the Pelagian controverſy on the ſubjects of *Grace*, and *original ſin*. But tho' his authority was very great in the Weſtern church, his doctrines had not been generally underſtood in their greateſt rigour, and eſpecially neither

neither himſelf nor any of his followers had ſaid much on the ſubject of *reprobation*, ſo that, notwithſtanding the *election* of ſome to eternal life, it was ſtill taken for granted, that the deſtruction of the wicked was from themſelves; that it was in their power to prevent it, and that Chriſt died for all men. In this period, however, we meet with a perſon, of a ſpeculative and ſerious turn (and there were always many ſuch among the monks) who ſeems to have purſued the leading principles of Auſtin pretty nearly to their full extent.

This was Godeſchalchus, a Saxon, a perſon of noble birth, firſt a monk in the monaſtery of Fulda, and then in that of Orbais, in the dioceſe of Soiſſons in France, and ordained a prieſt by a ſuffragan of the church of Rheims, of which Hincmar was archbiſhop. In A. D. 847 he viſited Rome, and on his return he lived with count Eberhard, one of the chief lords in the court of the emperor Lothaire; and diſcourſing in the preſence of Nothingus biſhop of Verona, concerning the doctrine of predeſtination, is ſaid to have maintained, that the predeſtination of God impoſes upon man a neceſſity of being virtuous, or wicked. The biſhop, offended at this, mentioned it to Rabanus Maurus, archbiſhop of Mentz, who promiſed to confute that doctrine in writing; and accordingly wrote a treatiſe in two Letters, one addreſſed to Nothin-

gus, and the other to count Eberhard, in which he quotes the authority of Auſtin himſelf againſt the doctrine of Godeſchalchus, and aſſerts that God predeſtinates only in conſequence of foreſeeing every thing that will come to paſs. This treatiſe was anſwered by Godeſchalchus, in a work in which, according to Hincmar, from whom only we have any account of it, he maintained that the reprobate are properly deſtined to damnation, tho' it was in conſequence of God's foreſeeing that they would live and die in ſin; ſo that, in this reſpect, it ſeems to have been a difference in words only. But he aſſerted that Chriſt did not die but for thoſe who were really ſaved.

Hitherto the univerſal opinion had been, that the proper effect of the obedience and death of Chriſt was reverſing the conſequence of the ſin of Adam, or giving men again that immortality which they had loſt in him; and that it was by the help of grace imparted at baptiſm that Chriſtians were enabled to do good works.

This controverſy excited ſo much attention that it having been the univerſal practice to decide upon all queſtions in councils, it was brought before one that was held by Rabanus at Mentz in October A. D. 848, in which, tho' Godeſchalchus, in explaining his ſentiments, ſaid that the wicked were predeſtinated to miſery on account of their wicked-

wickedneſs, he reproved Rabanus for ſaying, that the deſtruction of the wicked was not properly predeſtinated, but only foreſeen. His opinion was reprobated by the biſhops aſſembled on this occaſion, and Hincmar, in whoſe dioceſe he had been ordained, was directed not to ſuffer him to ſeduce the people, which it was ſaid he had done, making them indifferent to all good works.

Hincmar, having received and examined Godeſchalchus, preſented him to a council of biſhops, which was to meet together with the parliament of Charles the Bald at Quercy in A. D. 859. Thirteen biſhops were preſent on this occaſion, and after the examination of Godeſchalchus, he was judged to be heretical and incorrigible, and depoſed from the order of prieſtood. He was alſo, for what was called his obſtinacy and inſolence (the evidence of which, however, does not exiſt) ſentenced to be whipped with rods, and impriſoned. This cruel ſentence was executed, and with rigour, in the preſence of the king. He was alſo obliged to burn his own writings, and was then confined at the abbey of Hautvilliers in the dioceſe of Rheims. He continued, however, to write in his priſon, and publiſhed two confeſſions of his faith, expreſſing his earneſt deſire to defend what appeared to him to be the truth in the preſence of king Charles, of the biſhops, and the monks. It is likewiſe ſaid that

he profeſſed his willingneſs to put the truth of his opinions to the trial of fire or water.

Notwithſtanding the authority of Hincmar, and the other enemies of Godeſchalchus, he was not without friends, and ſome of them in high ſtations, or eminent for their literature. In particular Ratram, the learned monk of Corbie and Prudentius biſhop of Troyes, took his part; thinking his doctrine ſupported by the authority of Auſtin; and many others ſhewed a diſpoſition to join him. Theſe circumſtances contributed to draw the farther attention of king Charles; and in this age every prince conſidered himſelf as an authoriſed defender of the faith, and having conſulted with Ratram, this learned man wrote two books on the ſubject of predeſtination, and in them maintained the doctrine of two predeſtinations. This treatiſe, and another of Lupus abbot of Ferrara on the ſame ſide of the queſtion, the king gave to Hincmar for his examination.

Hincmar, and Pardulus biſhop of Laon, who took the ſame ſide, ſeeing the doctrine of two predeſtinations ſupported by the writings of Ratram, Lupus, and Prudentius, employed the deacon Amulacius, and John ſurnamed Erigena, a learned and ſubtle Iriſhman, to anſwer them. The work of the latter is ſtill extant, and in it he maintains that there is only one predeſtination, viz. that to eternal

eternal life, and that ſin and puniſhment, being only privations, could not properly be predeſtinated, or foreſeen. He alſo quotes St. Auſtin as favourable to his argument.

Prudentius replied to the work of John Erigena, treating him as a Pelagian, but did not undertake the defence of Godeſchalchus, who indeed does not appear to have been any farther concerned in the controverſy. Erigena was alſo anſwered by Florus a deacon of Lyons. Amolon the biſhop of this dioceſe, to whom Godeschalchus had ſent his writings, and ſeems on the whole to have been a well wiſher to him, reproved him for many things that he had advanced, eſpecially for aſſerting that they who, are redeemed by Chriſt cannot periſh, that the reprobate cannot be ſaved, and that God and the ſaints rejoice in their deſtruction. Remigius, who ſucceeded Amolon took the part of Godeſchalchus more openly, and in anſwer to ſome letters of Hincmar on the ſubject, complains of the hard fate of Godeſchalchus for defending the truth.

After the council of Soiſſons, in A. D. 853, king Charles coming to Quercy ſigned four articles, which had been there compoſed by Hincmar, againſt the doctrine of Godeſchalchus, in which he acknowledged only one predeſtination, viz. to eternal life, but allowed that God foreſaw,

tho' he did not decree, the deſtruction of the wicked. "God," ſays he, wills all to be ſaved. Some "he actually ſaves by his mercy, but others periſh "thro' their own fault." Prudentius of Troyes was induced to ſign theſe articles, and yet in the ſame year he declared himſelf of a different opinion in his writings; and on the whole the ſentiments of Godeſchalchus, tho' in ſome reſpects novel, appear to have been very prevalent, and were even ſanctioned by the moſt reſpectable councils.

The four articles of Hincmar being ſent to the church of Lyons, Remigius and his clergy were ſhocked at them, as, in their opinion, attacking the authority of the ſcriptures, the Fathers, and eſpecially St. Auſtin. The biſhop, therefore, anſwered them, maintaining the two-fold predeſtination. He maintained the ſame doctrine at the third council of Valence, aſſembled by the order of the emperor Lothaire in A. D. 855. There the biſhops determined that "the preſcience of God "does not impoſe upon man a neceſſity of being "wicked; that there are two predeſtinations of the "good to eternal life, and of the wicked to death; "and that Chriſt died only for thoſe who believe "in him. We reject" they ſay, "as hurtful and "contrary to truth, the four articles which have "been received with little precaution by our bre-

"thren

" thren. As to the grace without which no rea-
" ſonable creature ever lived well, and the free
" will which was weakened in Adam, and reſto-
" red by the grace of Chriſt, we believe what has
" been taught by the Fathers, the councils of Afri-
" ca and Orange, and what the popes have held;
" but we reject with diſdain the impertinent fables
" and queſtions of the Scots, which have been the
" occaſion of ſo lamentable a diviſion in theſe un-
" happy times." By this they meant the writings of John Erigena. The decrees of this council were confirmed in another held at Savonieres in A. D. 859, and ſeem to have had the ſanction of the papal ſee. Hincmar was not ſilenced by theſe councils; but wrote in defence of the four articles of Quercy, tho' Fleury ſays with more erudition than judgment. Vol. 10, p. 536.

It ſeems not a little extraordinary that, notwithſtanding the prevalence of Godeſchalchus's opinions, he himſelf continued in priſon, the ſentence paſſed againſt him not having been reverſed. There was probably ſomething offenſive in his manner, tho' nothing will juſtify the treatment he met with. Hincmar ſays he lived as other monks did, with every convenience of life, but that ever ſince he had been confined, he had never waſhed his hands or face, ſo that if he ſhould go abroad he would ſtrike perſons with horror. He

died

died in this ſtate of confinement in A. D. 868, and before he died rejected with indignation a formulary of confeſſion which Hincmar ſent him.

SECTION IV.

Of the Propagation of Chriſtianity in this Period.

CONSIDERABLE progreſs was made in the propagation of chriſtianity in the courſe of this period of our hiſtory; and though in moſt caſes the converſions were only nominal, and the chriſtianity to which Heathens were converted a miſerable ſuperſtition, it laid the foundation for ſomething of a better kind in future time. That the converſions made by the arms of Charlemagne were of little value, appeared when, in A. D. 842, Charles the ſon of Lewis gave the Saxons the option of taking what religion they pleaſed. For they choſe to return to paganiſm. In general the converſions in this period, as thoſe in the preceding, began with the princes, and therefore may be ſuſpected of having a political object; but ſome were brought about, in ſome meaſure at leaſt, in a better manner.

The

The Bulgarians having taken Adrianople in A. D. 813, and carried away many captives, and among them the archbiſhop Manuel, they were the means of converting many of that people. In A. D. 865, the king of Bulgaria, who had married a chriſtian, was himſelf converted, and ſent to the emperor of Conſtantinople for a biſhop, who baptized him; and his ſubjects in general followed his example. He was afterwards induced to ſend to Rome for farther inſtruction in the chriſtian religion; and this was the occaſion of legates and biſhops being ſent from thence; and at length the conteſt for the jurisdiction of this country contributed more than any other circumſtance to the final ſeparation of the two churches.

In A. D. 866, the Chazares ſent to the emperor Michael for ſome perſons to inſtruct them in the chriſtian faith, and he ſent Conſtantius, who after having learned their language, tranſlated the ſcriptures into it, and taught them the uſe of letters. In the ſame year, Bartilas, prince of the Moravians, hearing what the Chazares had done, ſent embaſſadors to the emperor Michael with the ſame requeſt; and acordingly he ſent two brothers, Conſtantine and Methodius, who were well received. Pope Nicolas, however, hearing of this, wrote to them, and engaged them to go to Rome, and receive biſhops of his ordination.

Methodius, who is called the archbiſhop of Sclavonia, converted the duke of Bohemia, his wife, and thirty of his nobles in A. D. 880. Moſt of the Sclavi were converted in A. D. 950, Otho having conquered Boleslaus king of Bohemia.

It is diſputed between the Greeks and the Latins which of them introduced chriſtianity into Hungary, but it was probably the former. *Moſheim*, 2. 184.

About A. D. 870, the Ruſſians received the chriſtian faith, the prince, as uſual, leading the way; but the circumſtances of this converſion have much the air of fable.

In A. D. 825 Heriold king of Denmark being driven from his country, had recourſe to the emperor Lewis; and in expectation of aſſiſtance from him, profeſſed himſelf a chriſtian, and was baptized, together with his children and many other Danes. When he returned to his dominions, he was accompanied by the monks Anſgar or Anſcaire, and Aubert. In A. D. 830 Anſcaire, accompanied by Vitmar, went to Sweden; and with the leave of the king preached with ſucceſs there; and to facilitate the converſion of thoſe northern nations, a biſhoprick was eſtabliſhed at Hamburgh, and Anſcaire was placed in the ſee; but he had to ſtruggle with great difficulties, and was ſome-

times

times obliged to leave the place on account of the ravages of the Normans. He was moſt zealous and indefatigable in his labours in all the northern parts of Europe, and had for his fellow labourers or ſucceſſors, beſides Witmar above mentioned, Ebbo, Rembert, and others. *Moſheim*, vol. 2, p. 16.

As chriſtianity gained ground in the North, it ſuffered in the Eaſt and the South, in conſequence of the power of the Saracens. In the civil wars among them, after the death of Haroun Alraſchid, the chriſtians were expoſed to great ſufferings, and many of them fled to Conſtantinople, where they were received with great humanity by the emperor Michael.

About the year A. D. 850, ſeveral chriſtians ſuffered death at Cordova, either for abandoning, or reviling the Mahometan religion; but the ſpirit with which they ſuffered is not to be commended. In general, they offered themſelves to the judges, who ſeem to have been unwilling to hurt them. This conduct was much blamed by many of their fellow chriſtians at the time; and an aſſembly of the clergy convoked by king Abderame on the occaſion, forbade the offering themſelves to martyrdom, tho' they did not chuſe to paſs any cenſure on thoſe who had done it. As many perſons would not conſider them as martyrs, Eulogius, a prieſt of Cordova,

Cordova, wrote a hiſtory and defence of them. He himſelf was afterwards, put to death for ſecreting a young woman who had renounced the Mahometan religion. Fleury condemns the conduct of thoſe who offered themſelves to martyrdom; but ſays that the authority of the church, which has received them as martyrs and ſaints, and among them Eulogius their defender, ought to arreſt our judgment, vol. 10, p. 510.

It is ſaid that the monks oppoſed the aſſeſſment of the eſtates that had been given to their order, and that on this the king cauſed the council above mentioned to be held; but that it was reprobated, and Eulogius choſen archbiſhop of Toledo for the zeal he ſhewed on the occaſion, tho' he was ſoon after apprehended, and executed. *Robinſon*, p. 234.

SECTION

SECTION V.

Of the State of the Jews and Chriſtian Sectaries, and of the Riſe of peculiar Opinions, within this Period.

IN the time of Agobard biſhop of Lyons, the Jews were very numerous in that city, and its neighbourhood, and many chriſtians adopted their cuſtoms. Writing to Nebrodius biſhop of Narbonne, he ſays that ſome chriſtians obſerved the ſabbath as they did, working on ſundays, and paying no regard to the appointed faſts. Many women, he ſays, were corrupted by them, and ſaid that they were of the race of the patriarchs and prophets. Nay, many of the common people went ſo far as to ſay that the Jews were the only true people of God, and who adhered to the true religion. They alſo ſaid that the Jews preached better than the chriſtian prieſts. It appears by the account of a famine in Germany in the ninth century, that the laws of Moſes ſo far as they related to the eating of things ſtrangled, were binding upon chriſtians; it being ſaid that neceſſity alone

made

made it excuſable to eat of a hind that had been killed by wolves. But the prohibition to eat of things ſtrangled, and blood, had the ſanction of the apoſtles, and it is to this day obſerved in all the Eaſt.

The Jews were not, however, without ſome reaſon to complain of the treatment they met with in this period. Their ſlaves were ſometimes baptized, and then, to their great prejudice, obtained their liberty. The emperor Lewis, who was diſpoſed to favour them, made the conſent of the maſter, tho' a Jew, neceſſary to the baptizing of a ſlave. Of this Agobard, who wrote againſt them, complained; ſaying, that the Jews ought to be indemnified for the loſs of their ſlaves, but that ſalvation ought not to be denied to any. At a council held at Metz in A. D. 888, chriſtians were forbidden to eat with Jews.

It has been obſerved, that in general, the Saracens were diſpoſed to favour thoſe chriſtians who were deemed heretical, as leſs liable to take part with the Greek emperors againſt them. But Politieu the Melchite patriarch of Alexandria, being a phyſician, and having cured a concubine of the caliph Haroun Alraſchid, he gave him the poſſeſſion of all the churches which had been uſurped by the Jacobites in that city.

It

It was ſeen in the former part of this work how much the Gnoſtic doctrines, which aroſe from the oriental philoſophy, ſpread among chriſtians, appearing in the time of the apoſtles, and ſhewing themſelves in different forms to the time of Manes. They were long conſidered as the only proper heretics in the chriſtian church, being excluded from other churches, and forming ſeparate ſocieties of their own. From one Paul, who is ſaid to have adopted and modified the doctrines of Manes, tho' it is not known at what time he lived, many of them were called *Paulicians*; and they were ſo numerous in Phrygia, Lycaonia, and eſpecially Armenia, that at length, urged no doubt by perſecution, they formed a ſeparate ſtate; and like the Donatiſts in Africa, were frequently at war with the Greek emperors.

The only account that we have of the principles of the Paulicians is given by Peter the Sicilian, who in A. D. 871, was ſent by the emperor Baſiliscus to Tibrica the capital of the Paulicians in Armenia, to treat of an exchange of priſoners. He was with them nine months; and having informed himſelf concerning their doctrines, he wrote an account of them, dedicating his work to the firſt archbiſhop of Bulgaria, where the Paulicians were making many converts. For they were indefati-

gable

tigable in propagating their doctrine, and had great ſucceſs in that country.

According to this writer, the Paulicians acknowledged two principles, the one good, and the other bad, the latter the author of this world, and the former of the world to come. They received none of the books of the old Teſtament, but all thoſe of the new, except the two epiſtles of Peter. They alſo made great account of ſome epiſtles of one Sergius, a perſon of note among them. Jeſus, they ſaid, brought his body from heaven. They rejected the euchariſt, and according to other accounts, baptiſm alſo; and as Theophanes ſaid, they denied the incarnation; and as the Albigenſes, who were in part derived from them, were not trinitarians, it is pretty clear that they were not what was called orthodox in that reſpect.

The Paulicians were much divided among themſelves, and a particular account of their different ſects may be ſeen in Fleury, Vol. 10, p. 105, but it is not of much conſequence to be acquainted with them. It is ſaid that there are probably Paulicians ſtill in France and Bulgaria. *Moſheim* Vol. 2, p. 175.

The emperor Nicephorus was much attached to the Paulicians, but they were cruelly perſecuted by the emperor Michael in A. D. 811. The patriarch Nicephorus and others remonſtrated againſt his

his ſeverity, but the abbot Theophanes approved of it. At this time one Conſtantine is ſaid to have made ſome alteration in their doctrine, and to have had many diſciples. But by the order of Michael he was ſeized, and ſtoned to death. His own diſciples were ordered to throw the ſtones, but none of them would hurt him, except one Juſtus, whom he had adopted ſome years before, and inſtructed with particular care. He gave him the mortal blow. It is remarkable that one Simeon, who executed the orders of the emperor, was afterwards a convert to the Paulicians, and ſucceeding Conſtantine as head of the ſect, called himſelf Titus. By the order of Juſtin II. he was apprehended, and with ſome others burned to death.

In A. D. 845 the empreſs Theodora undertook to extirpate the Paulicians, and it is ſaid that a hundred thouſand of them were deſtroyed. Many of them fled to the Saracens, and joined them againſt the Romans. Cryſocheris, a chief among the Paulicians, had great reputation for his prudence and valour. He was very troubleſome to the Romans, making frequent incurſions into the territories of the emperor, and taking many priſoners. At length, however, he was defeated and ſlain.

A ſchiſm of ſome continuance in the Greek church was occaſioned by the emperor Conſtan-

tine Porphyrogeneta divorcing his wife and marrying another. The monk Theodore Studites, many of whoſe writings are come down to us, his brother Joſeph biſhop of Theſſalonica, and Platon a perſon of noble family, famous for abandoning conſiderable employments and becoming a monk, diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their oppoſition to this marriage, and the laſt of them actually excommunicated the emperor on account of it. On their refuſing to communicate with another Joſeph, a prieſt who had performed the ceremony of marriage (conſidering him as one who had authoriſed adultery) a council was called, in conſequence of which the perſons above mentioned were baniſhed to different places, and Theodore appealed to the pope. However, the emperor Michael recalled them, and put an end to the ſchiſm by the baniſhment of the prieſt Joſeph.

The emperor Michael the Stammerer diſtinguiſhed himſelf not a little by the freedom of his thinking in ſeveral reſpects. He did not believe that there was any devil, becauſe, as he obſerved, Moſes ſaid nothing of one. He maintained that Judas Iſcariot was ſaved, and he allowed of no oath but by the ſupreme God. Having been educated at Amorium in Phrygia, which abounded with Paulicians, he retained ſome of their principles, and is ſaid to have denied the reſurrection.

In

In this period was the origin of the afterwards famous doctrine of *tranſubſtantiation*. In A. D. 831, Paſchaſius Radbert, a monk of Corbie, at the requeſt of one of his diſciples, wrote a treatiſe on the euchariſt, in which he maintained that the elements of bread and wine were the real body and blood of Chriſt, the very ſame that was born of the virgin Mary, and that after conſecration the ſubſtance of bread and wine did not remain in them: From this he drew three conſequences, viz, that Chriſt is truly ſacrificed every day, but in a myſtery; that the euchariſt is at the ſame time the truth and a figure; and that the elements are not ſubject to the proceſs of digeſtion. By this means he maintained what was called the doctrine of the *real preſence*, and he laid ſo much ſtreſs upon it, as to ſay that they who did not believe it were worſe than the openly profane. This doctrine, however, being new, had not at firſt many adherents, and at the requeſt of Charles the Bald, Ratram anſwered the treatiſe of Paſchaſius. *

* La Croze ſays he conſiders the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation as having originated in Egypt, and to have been a conſequence of the doctrine of the Monophyſites. It there appeared as an aſſumption of the bread and wine in the euchariſt, into an hypoſtatical union with the body and blood of Chriſt; and by their union making but one nature with him. *Chriſtianisme d' Armenie*, *b.* 865.

In A. D. 846, the ſame Paſchaſius wrote treatiſe to prove that the virgin Mary, having conceived without concupiſcence, was free from the pains of childbirth, and was even delivered without any opening of the womb; Jeſus having paſſed thro' her fleſh, as it is ſuppoſed that he did thro' the door, without opening it, when he appeared to his diſciples, *the door*, as we read, *being ſhut*. Ratram oppoſed this opinion alſo, but Paſchaſius defended it, and charged his adverſary with denying the virginity of Mary. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2, p. 162.

The doctrine of the *trinity* was ſufficiently eſtabliſhed in this period; but the concluſion of an antient hymn *te trina deitas unaque poſcimus*, giving offence to Hincmar, he wiſhed to have it left out. The monks, however, joined by Gotheſchalcus, who tho' in priſon wrote in defence of it, oppoſing him, it continued to be ſung as before. *Ib.* Vol. 2, p. 160.

SECTION

SECTION VI.

Of the State of the Clergy in this Period.

WE have ſeen in the preceding periods of this hiſtory, how very different a ſet of men were the chriſtian clergy, and the original humble and ſuffering teachers of the religion of Jeſus. In every ſubſequent period we ſhall find them advancing in their pretenſions, and the laity aiding that advancement, both with reſpect to ſpiritual and temporal power. Their ſuppoſed power in ſpirituals contributed much to overawe an ignorant age, ſo that their power was hardly thought to have any bounds.

The biſhops of France, in their letter to king Lewis (ſaid to be written by Hincmar archbiſhop of Rheims) ſaid he ought "to compel the lords who "had ſeized the goods of the church to make ſa-"tisfaction, and do penance. Would you aug-"ment your kingdom at the expence of your "ſoul? The churches which God has confided to "us are not fiefs, which the kings can give and "take away as they pleaſe, but goods conſecrated "to God, which cannot be alienated without ſa-

"crilege. We are not ſecular perſons, who can "make ourſelves vaſſals, and take oaths contrary to "the ſcriptures and the canons. It would be an "abomination if thoſe hands which have received "the unction of the holy chriſm, and by "prayer and the ſign of the croſs make bread and "wine become the body and blood of Chriſt, "ſhould become ſlaves to an oath, any more than "the tongue of the biſhop, who has the key of "heaven. If any have exacted ſuch an oath of "biſhops, both they who have exacted it, and "they who have taken it, ought to do penance for it."

The giving of fiefs to biſhops and monks, which began with Charlemagne, and had never been done by the Lombard princes, was felt as a great evil in this period; and the inſecure ſtate of property contributed much to increaſe the evil, many perſons giving their lands to the church for their greater ſecurity, reſerving only a certain allowance out of them to themſelves. When the heirs to ſuch eſtates failed, they fell wholly to the church. Hence the diſtinction between *feudum datum* and *feudum oblatum*. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 366. When, afterwards, Arnold of Breſcia maintained that fiefs could not be given to the church, he was deemed a heretic. Ib. p. 323.

The power of adminiſtering, and conſequently of with-holding, the ſacraments of the church,

was

was a great inſtrument of the power of the clergy, and was often uſed very improperly. The ſame Hincmar of Rheims, complaining of Hincmar biſhop of Laon, his nephew and ſuffragan, ſays, he had laid an interdict on the whole dioceſe of Laon, forbidding to celebrate maſs, to baptize children, appoint penance, give the viaticum to the dying, or bury the dead; and ſays he was ſhocked at it. This ſhews, ſays Fleury, that theſe general interdicts were not then common, tho' particular ones were in uſe.

Diſpenſations for marrying within the prohibited degrees was a great ſource of wealth and power to the clergy; and in this period the idea of *ſpiritual affinity*, between godfathers and godmothers, and their ſons and daughters, as an impediment to marriage, was introduced. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 365.

Much as the princes had to complain of the uſurpation of the biſhops, it was derived from their own ſuperſtition, in ſanctioning the decrees of councils. Charlemagne, a little before his death, appointed councils to be held at five different places in his dominions, the decrees of which were brought to him, and he added the civil authority to thoſe of them that required it. He alſo ordered that, in any ſtage of a lawſuit, if either of the parties applied to a biſhop, his ſentence ſhould be

accepted, and that the evidence of a ſingle biſhop ſhould always be admitted by judges. This he thought was agreeable to a law of Conſtantine, which has ſince been proved to be ſpurious. Tho' as Fleury ſays, it has ſerved much to extend the juriſdiction of the biſhops.

The biſhops had all the power of civil magiſtrates. At the council of Mayence in A. D. 813, it was ordered that the vagabond and independent clergy (probably the diſciples of Adelbert or Clement, mentioned in the preceding period,) thoſe who were not in the ſervice of any prince, or under any biſhop or abbot, ſhould be arreſted by the biſhop of the dioceſe without delay, that if they would not ſubmit, they ſhould be excommunicated, and that if this did not correct them, they ſhould be impriſoned, in order to be judged in a council.*

In the Capitulary of Charles the Bald, in A. D. 853, lords were forbidden to hinder the biſhops from ordering the ſerfs on their eſtates to be beaten when their crimes required it. Accordingly the count and his officers were ordered to accompany the biſhops in their viſitations, to compel thoſe who could not be reduced by mere excommunication

* It was Charlemagne who gave the popes and other biſhops the privilege of having priſons, which before his time had not been allowed even in Rome. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 365.

cation to do penance. Pope Nicolas, writing to the king of Bulgaria concerning ſome of his ſubjects who had apoſtatized, ſays "If they cannot be "reclaimed they muſt be excommunicated, and "repreſſed by the ſecular power. For the king ought "to chaſtiſe thoſe who are faithleſs to God, no leſs "than thoſe who are faithleſs to himſelf. *Fleury*, Vol. 11. p. 108.

This interference of the ſpiritual and temporal powers did not paſs without notice or complaint. The emperor Lewis having held an aſſembly at Aix in A. D. 828, to enquire into the cauſes of the diſorders of the times, in order to apply a remedy to them, Vala the abbot of Corbie ſaid, that the temporal and ſpiritual powers encroached upon each other, that the emperor quitted his duty to attend to matters of religion, which did not concern him, and that the biſhops were occupied in temporal affairs. The ſame complaint of the interference of the two powers was made at the council of Paris in the year following, and in the ſecond council of Aix la Chapelle in A. D. 836.

In the conteſt between the temporal and ſpiritual powers, we do not wonder to find the latter repreſented as ſuperior to the former. Pope Gregory having taken the part of Lothaire againſt his father Lewis, and accompanied him into France, addreſſed a letter to the biſhops who favoured the father, in which he maintained that the eccleſiaſti-

cal authority was ſuperior to the ſecular, and that on this occaſion they ought to obey him rather than the emperor. Pope Nicolas, writing to the king of Bulgaria, ſays, "You laymen ought not "to judge the prieſts, or any of the clergy, nor ex- "amine their lives. You muſt leave all to the "judgment of the biſhops."

The ſame pope, who approached very near to the character of Gregory VII, made biſhops the judges even of kings. Writing to Adventius biſhop of Metz, he ſays, "You ſay you ſubmit to "your king as your ſuperior. But firſt ſee that "thoſe kings and princes be ſo in reality. See "that they conduct themſelves well. Otherwiſe "they are to be conſidered as tyrants, and not "kings, and ought to be reſiſted, and not ſubmit- "ted to." This, as Fleury ſays, was making them judges whether the princes were tyrants or not, and not only the biſhops, but all ſubjects; for the reaſon applies to all. Vol. 11, p. 76. Hincmar, archbiſhop of Rheims being threatened by king Lewis if he would not ordain Odacre biſhop of Beauvais, perſiſted in his refuſal, and ſaid in anſwer, "It is not you who have choſen me biſhop "to govern the church, but it is I who, with my "colleagues and other chriſtians, have choſen you "to govern the kingdom, on condition that you "obſerve the laws."

Fulk

Fulk, another archbiſhop of Rheims, proceeded further than this. For being informed that Charles the Simple intended to make peace with the Normans, he wrote to diſſuade him from it, threatening that if he did, he would renounce his allegiance to him, and perſuade as many as he could to do the ſame, and that joining with his brethern, he would condemn him to an eternal anathema. What is more extraordinary, princes ſeem to have acknowledged the power of the biſhops to depoſe them. For at the council of Savoniers, held in A. D. 859, Charles the Bald complained that Vanelon archbiſhop of Sens had broken his promiſe not to depoſe him from his royal dignity, at leaſt without the biſhops who had joined him in his conſecration.

One inſtrument of the power of the biſhops over princes was their making them ſubmit to do penance, which according to the canons of the council of Nice, and the decretals of pope Siricius, diſqualified them for bearing arms. The emperor Lewis being overpowered by his ſons, they and their partiſans, made him undergo a public penance, that he might be afterwards deemed incapable of reigning. Among other offences, he confeſſed that he had marched his troops without neceſſity in lent, and that he had fixed on holy thurſday for the meeting of a parliament. This, ſays

Fleury,

Fleury, is the ſecond attempt of the eccleſiaſtical power over the ſecular, the firſt being that in the caſe of Vamba in Spain, mentioned before. In both theſe caſes, however, the power of the church would have availed nothing without power of a temporal kind. But the laity were not aware of the advantage which they gave the clergy in making this uſe of their ſpiritual weapons to ſerve their own purpoſes.

There was great cauſe of complaint in this period on account of the appointment of improper perſons to biſhopricks. Tho' the emperor Lewis. in the parliament at Attigni, in A. D. 822, reſtored the election of biſhops to the clergy and people, forbidding the interference of any prince, yet it appears that, in many caſes, the biſhoprics were conſidered as the property of the king or the great lords, and diſpoſed of without any regard to the choice of the people. On the death of Seulph archbiſhop of Rheims in A. D. 925, ſuppoſed to have been poiſoned by Hebert count of Vermandois, his ſon Hughes, a child of five years old, was made biſhop, and the election was confirmed by pope John X, Abbon biſhop of Soiſſons diſcharging the epiſcopal functions for him. Hebert afterwards employed Odalric archbiſhop of Aix to perform the ſpiritual functions; and while he enjoyed the temporalites, he lived with his wife in the epiſ-

epiſcopal palace. Afterwards, Roul king of France quarrelling with him, Hughes was expelled from the ſee, and another was choſen in his place.

Atton of Verceil, in his letters of diſcipline, complains of patrons for giving biſhopricks according to the riches, the relationſhip, or ſervices, of the candidate, bringing up their children for them; and he humouroufly notes the ridicule attending the examination of ſuch children, who were taught to repeat their anſwers by heart, or read in a paper, which, he ſays, was held with trembling hands, for fear of loſing the preferment; thoſe who put the queſtions to them well knowing that they did not underſtand what they were ſaying, and who only put the uſual queſtions in order to obſerve the canonical forms, thus committing injuſtice in the guiſe of truth. Vol. 12. p. 112. Thoſe biſhops, he adds, who were ordained contrary to the rules were accuſed without reſpect, unjuſtly oppreſſed, perfidiouſly expelled, and ſometimes cruelly put to death. We are not ſurprized that, in this ſtate of things, at the ignorance of ſome biſhops. Freculph biſhop of Liſieux had not an intire bible.

We have an example of another kind of irregularity in the church of Conſtantinople, where Tryphon was choſen in A. D. 928, till Theophylact the ſon of the emperor Romanus ſhould be of a pro-

a proper age to be advanced to that dignity. This, says Fleury, was the first example of this species of abuse.

We do not, that I remember, read of any *pluralities* till this period, but there is a remarkable example of this abuse in Manasseh archbishop of Arles, a relation of king Hugo, getting himself made bishop of Verona, Mantua, and Trent.

Translations were as yet very rare, tho' in other respects the antient customs in the appointments of bishops were violated. On the death of Venilon archbishop of Sens, the pope made some difficulty of admitting Egilon, a monk in another diocese, to succeed him; it having been an established rule, that the place of every bishop should be filled by some of the clergy of the same church, or from another if no person in it should be found capable. But the contrary practice, Fleury says, was now become common in France.

When bishoprics and abbacies were chiefly desired, and bestowed, as offices of power and profit, we do not wonder that the possessors of them lived in all respects like other great lords, and that many of them still bore arms. At a battle in the south of France in A. D. 844, Ebroin bishop of

of Poitiers, and chaplain * to king Charles, and alſo Lupus abbot of Ferriers, were taken priſoners; ſo that even abbots, tho' prieſts and biſhops, bore arms like other lords, pretending that they were obliged to do ſo on account of their fiefs. In fact, little regard was paid to the regulations of Charlemagne on this ſubject.

Much complaint was made by the prieſts of the oppreſſion of their biſhops in their viſitations at Thouloufe in A. D. 360, when, by the order of king Charles, ſeveral regulations were made to remedy the evil. At a council at Conſtantinople in A. D. 870, archbiſhops were forbidden, on the pretence of viſitations, to live without neceſſity upon their ſuffragans, thus conſuming the revenues of the churches under them. Metropolitans were alſo forbidden to get their duty done by their ſuffragans while they attended to temporal affairs. Here we ſee, ſays Fleury, why thoſe biſhops were called ſuffragans. Vol. 11. p. 261.

Greater complaint ſtill was made in this period of the debauched lives that many of the clergy, who were not allowed to marry. In the Capitu-

* The word *chaplain* was derived from the cuſtom of the kings of France carrying the cap of St. Martin with them to battle, hoping by its means to gain the victory, and a prieſt had the charge of it. *Fleury* Vol. 10. p. 49.

pitulary of Hincmar, compoſed in A. D. 852, there are ſo many injunctions againſt the clergy having any communication with women, that Fleury ſays, there is reaſon to fear there was much irregularity in that reſpect. At the council of Mayence in A. D. 888 prieſts were forbidden to lodge with any woman whatever, becauſe ſome had been found to have children by their own ſiſters. Atton of Verceil, in his letters of diſcipline, complains that many of the clergy maintained two concubines, with whom they lived publickly, that theſe women governed the houſe, and after their death inherited what they had amaſſed of the goods of the church, and the donations of the faithful. This, ſays he, gave occaſion to the officers of juſtice to enter the houſes of the clergy, on pretence of removing thoſe women and their children, the canons having condemned ſuch concubines to ſervitude. To enrich thoſe women and their families, he ſays, "the clergy "become avaritious, plunderers, uſurpers, and "cheats, which cools the devotion of the people, "and prevents their paying their tithes; ſo that "the lower clergy are ſo poor, that they are hardly "able to ſubſiſt. When the biſhops," he ſays, "reprove them for theſe diſorders, they often re-"volt againſt them, ſeek the protection of power-"ful lords, and often take part with the enemies "of

"of the church, and some would excuse them-
"selves by saying they could not live without wo-
"men."

Alvarus Pelagius in a treatise intitled *The complaints of the church*, says, It were to be wished that the clergy had never vowed chastity, especially those in Spain, where the sons of the laity are not more numerous than the sons of the clergy. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 165.

That these irregularities were not confined to the West, we see in the account of Theophylact patriarch of Constantinople, who died in A. D. 956, which, in order to give a faithful picture of the age, I think ought not to be omitted. It is, however, a singular case, and in any other than a son of the emperor would not have been borne. At the age of sixteen he was put in possession of this dignity, and held it twenty-three years. While he was under the care of another he appeared discreet and moderate, but when his tutors were dismissed he abandoned himself to the most shameful and criminal actions. He set to sale all ecclesiastical promotions, he had the most violent passion for hunting and horses, of which he had more than two thousand, and he fed them not with hay and barley, but with almonds, dates, raisins, and other delicacies, with figs dipped in the finest wines, &c. As he was celebrating mass

on a holy thurſday, his hoſtler came to tell him that a mare of which he was particularly fond had foled, when he was ſo overjoyed, that after getting thro' the litany as faſt as he poſſibly could, he ran to the ſtable to ſee the foal, and returned to the great church to finiſh the ſervice. He introduced the cuſtom of dancing in churches on the great feſtivals, with indecent geſtures, and common ſongs. His death was occaſioned by being cruſhed againſt a wall as he was riding full ſpeed after languiſhing two years. When he recovered after ſeeming to be at the point of death, he behaved better, but afterwards he appeared not to be at all reformed. He ſtill ſold his biſhopricks, was fond of horſes, and lived an effeminate life, unworthy of his ſtation. At length his diſorder turned to a dropſy of which he died.

Notwithſtanding the ignorance, ſuperſtition, and extreme depravity, of this age, it was not deſtitute of good ſenſe and real piety. In one of the memoirs written by Charlemagne a little before his death, we find ſome excellent obſervations on the manners of the clergy and the monks of his time, and a juſt preference of good morals to what were uſually deemed the greateſt virtues of the age. Speaking of the clergy, he ſays, "I would aſk "them what it is to quit the world, and how we "are to diſtinguiſh thoſe who abandon it from "thoſe

" thoſe who remain in it, if it be that they only do " not carry arms, and are not married publickly; " if he who has abandoned the world ceaſe not " to increaſe his poſſeſſions every day, and by all " means, promiſing paradice, or threatening hell, " employing the names of the ſaints to perſuade " ſimple people to part with their wealth, and de- " prive their lawful heirs; who being thus reduced " to poverty, think public robbery, and all crimes, " permitted to them? Of what uſe," ſays he, " is " it to the church, that the ſuperior of a commu- " nity is more deſirous to have a great number of " ſubjects, than to have them good, and to have " them ſing and read well, than to have them live " well? For tho' care ought to be taken about " reading and ſinging, the perfection of morals is " of greater importance; and tho' it is a good " thing that churches be built, and ornamented, " the ornament of virtue is preferable." *Fleury*, Vol. 10. p. 96.

We are not to conclude from the diſſolute lives of ſome of the clergy, that the whole body was ſo corrupt. On the contrary, I have no doubt but that the majority of them had ſuch virtues as were held in eſteem in that age, and decent good morals were never wholly overlooked in the moſt ſuperſtitious times. They could not otherwiſe have had any degree of credit with the people, and

the religion they taught would have been exploded.

As a ſpecimen of the better ſort of the clergy of this period, I ſhall mention ſome particulars of the life of Udalric, biſhop of Augſburg. After the death of Henry the Fowler, he declined going to court, or to lead his troops in perſon, having devolved that duty on Adalberon his nephew, and gave himſelf wholly to his ſpiritual functions. He recited the office every day with the clergy of his cathedral, and moreover the office of the virgin, and of the croſs, and alſo that of all the ſaints, beſides ſeveral pſalms, and the whole pſalter every day, or as much as he could. Every day, he ſaid one maſs, and ſometimes two or three maſſes. He obſerved all the rules of the monaſtery, lying on a matt, wearing no linen, and eating no fleſh, tho' it was ſerved in abundance to his gueſts. The greateſt part of the firſt courſe at his table was diſtributed to the poor, or invalides of all ſorts, who were fed every day in his preſence. He chearfully exerciſed hoſpitality to all perſons, eſpecially the clergy, the monks, and the nuns, and he took great care of the education and inſtruction of his clergy. He heard with great kindneſs the complaints of the ſerfs of his eſtates, both againſt their lords his vaſſals, or other ſerfs, and reſolutely did them juſtice. He was never idle, but

but always employed in regulating his canons or his ſchool, providing for the maintenance of his family, repairing or ornamenting his church, or fortifying his city againſt the frequent incurſions of the Hungarians. He regularly viſited his dioceſe in a carriage drawn by oxen; not that he objected to riding, but that he might have the company of his chaplain, and that they might ſing pſalms. For he always went with a great company of prieſts and other clergy, alſo of laymen from among his vaſſals, choſen ſerſs of his own family, and poor perſons, and defrayed all their expences. On his viſitations he preached, heard complaints, examined the prieſts, confirmed, and ſometimes continued all night in the churches, without even diſmiſſing the people.

It is to be obſerved that an attention to the ſerſs was expected of the clergy. Every biſhop or abbot was to give liberty to three of them, and at a council held in England in A. D. 817, it was ordered that when a biſhop died, beſides giving a tenth of his effects to the poor, all his ſlaves, or villeins, of the Engliſh nation ſhould be ſet free.

SECTION VII.

Of the Popes in this Period.

SOME acceſſion was gained to the temporalities of the papal ſee in this period. On the election of Paſchal A. D. 817, the emperor Lewis, beſides confirming the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne, added to them the city and duchy of Rome, with the iſles of Sardinia and Corſica. Still, however, the emperor retained the ſovereignty of all thoſe ſtates, and confirmed the election of the popes before their conſecration. But Charles the Bald in A. D. 876 granted the ſovereignty of Rome to the Apoſtolic ſee. *Giannone*, Vol. I. p. 265.

If the emperor claimed the right of confirming the election of the popes, the popes, in return, ſoon availed themſelves of the part they performed in the ceremony of the conſecration of princes, to aſſume a right to diſpoſe of their crowns. Pope Nicolas, writing to the biſhops of Charles the Bald, ſays, "Let not the emperor turn againſt the "faithful the ſword which he received from the "vicar of St. Peter. Let him govern the king-"dom which has fallen to him by ſucceſſion, con-"firmed

" firmed by the authority of the holy ſee, and by " the crown which the ſovereign pontiff has put " upon his head."

As far as circumſtances favoured them, the popes were always ready to carry their pretenſions into act. This appeared in the hiſtory of Lothaire king of Lorrain. His wife Thetberge, having confeſſed that ſhe had been debauched by her own brother before her marriage, was repudiated by order of the biſhops in council, and he married Valdrade. Thetberge, however, having intereſted pope Nicolas in her favour, he compelled Lothaire to take her again, and excommunicated Valdrade. The king even wrote a very ſubmiſſive letter to the pope, begging that he would not raiſe above him any of his equals to eſtabliſh themſelves in his ſtates; dreading, as the hiſtorian ſays, leſt his uncles ſhould take advantage of his ſituation. This pope, writing to Thetberge, who had deſired to be divorced from her huſband, and come to live at Rome, diſſuaded her from it; ſaying, that if Lothaire ſhould make any attempt upon her life, of which ſhe was apprehenſive, it would be to put himſelf and his kingdom into peril, as ſhe had not only innocence, but the protection of the church and the people of the holy ſee.

On the death of this Lothaire, pope Adrian declared that " if any perſon oppoſed the juſt pre-

" tenſions of the emperor to the ſucceſſion, let " him know that the holy ſee is for this prince, " and that the arms which God has put into our " hands are prepared for his defence." Thus, ſays Fleury, did the pope make himſelf the arbiter of crowns. When, notwithſtanding this threat of the pope, Charles ſeized the ſtates of his brother Lothaire, Adrian wrote to him, inſiſting on his giving them up to his brother, the lawful heir, who was then fighting againſt the Saracens; ſaying, that after the third admonition, " we will " ourſelves come upon the place, and do what " belongs to our miniſtry." He likewiſe admoniſhed the biſhops to refuſe him the communion if he did not obey. However Hincmar archbiſhop of Rheims replied with great ſpirit to the pope, telling him, that he could not be at the ſame time king, and biſhop, that his predeceſſors regulated the church, but not the ſtate, which belonged to the kings. " If," ſays he, " the pope will pro- " cure peace, let him not excite quarrels; for he " will not perſuade us that we cannot arrive at the " kingdom of heaven without receiving the king " that he gives us on earth."

In this period we meet with the firſt mention of the donation of Conſtantine to the ſee of Rome, now univerſally allowed to be a forgery. Æneas biſhop of Paris, writing on the ſubject of the differences

ferences between the Latin and Greek churches, ſays that when the emperor Conſtantine became a Chriſtian, he left Rome; ſaying, "it was not con-"venient for two emperors, one the prince of the "earth, and the other of the church, to govern "in the ſame city." He therefore fixed his reſidence at Conſtantinople, and gave Rome and a great part of ſeveral provinces to the apoſtolic ſee; thus inveſting the Roman pontiff with royal authority, and cauſed an authentic act of it to be drawn up, and univerſally diſperſed.

The only rival of the pope in this period was the patriarch of Conſtantinople; but of his pretenſions pope Nicolas made very light. Writing to the king of Bulgaria, who was lately become a Chriſtian, and wiſhed to know to which of the two churches he was to be ſubject, he ſays, "The "true patriarchs are thoſe who govern the churches "that were founded by the apoſtles, viz. thoſe of "Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The biſhops "of Conſtantinople, and of Jeruſalem, have the "name, but not the ſame authority; for the church "of Conſtantinople was not founded by any of "the apoſtles, and the biſhop of Jeruſalem was "only ſtiled a biſhop, and not a metropolitan, "by the council of Nice. But next to Rome, "was the patriarch of Alexandria." Notwithſtanding theſe high pretenſions, and every means

that the popes had recourſe to for the purpoſe, they did not ſucceed in gaining the ſuperintendance of the churches in Bulgaria. For the Bulgarians received their biſhops from the Greek church. *

The power of the pope in eccleſiaſtical matters, tho' allowed to be extenſive, was never exactly defined, and therefore was ſometimes diſputed by the biſhops, eſpecially when ſupported by the temporal powers. But ſometimes by argument in this ignorant age, and ſometimes by policy, the popes generally carried every point in the end.

Pope Nicolas, in anſwer to the ſynodical letter of the council of Senlis, in A. D. 863, ſays, "When the laws are contrary to the canons, theſe "ought to prevail, but appeals to the holy ſee "were

* The biſhops of Rome had no authority over the Spaniſh church till the eighth century. The proof of this is taken from forty ſynods held between A. D. 324 and 694, none of which were aſſembled by the biſhops of Rome, in which he had no repreſentative, and which were notified to him for his approbation. In ſome of them he was not ſo much as mentioned, and tho' in them many canons were made for the regulation of eccleſiaſtical hierarchies, there is not the leaſt mention of the papal ſupremacy in them. *Robinſon*, p. 178 from *Geddes's Tracts*. Vol. 2.

"were eſtabliſhed by the council of Sardica. *
"We will defend till death the privileges of our
"ſee, and you yourſelves have an intereſt in it.
"How do you know but what has happened to
"Rothade (who had been depoſed in a council
"in France, and whoſe part was taken by the pope)
"to day, may happen to you to-morrow; and in
"that caſe to whom would yon have recourſe?"
Writing to all the biſhops of Gaul, the ſame pope
ſays, "Some of you ſay that the decretals are not
"among the canons. But if we reject the decrees
"of the antient popes, becauſe they are not among
"the canons, we muſt reject the writings of Gre-
"gory, and the other popes, and even the holy
"ſcriptures." He then proceeds to prove by the
"authority of Leo and Gelaſius, that all the de-
cretals of the popes ought to be received without
exception. At this time it was univerſally allowed
that the canons of the general councils were of the
higheſt authority, equal to that of the ſcriptures;
and the authenticity of the decretals was un-
queſtioned.

Not-

* The fourth canon of this council, ſuppoſing it to be genuine, related only to the particular caſe of a biſhop depoſed by the neighbouring prelates; when it was ordered that another ſhould not be appointed till the biſhop of Rome had examined the cauſe, and pronounced ſentence. *Mosheim*, Vol. 1. p. 288.

Notwithſtanding the almoſt impoſſibility of convicting a prieſt of any crime, on account of the evidence required for it, he ſtill had a remedy in an appeal to Rome. The clergy of Bretagne having conſulted Leo IV in A. D. 848 about what was to be done with ſimoniacal prieſts, he ſaid they ought to be depoſed, but only in a council, and by twelve biſhops, and on the evidence of ſeventy perſons; and if the perſon accuſed demand to be heard at Rome, he muſt be ſent thither.

This period furniſhes ſeveral inſtances of the popes diſpenſing with the obligation of *oaths*; and it ſeems to have been generally taken for granted, that they had this power, as being included in that of *binding and looſing* given to Peter. The emperor Lewis having been compelled by the duke of Benevento, who had him in his power, never to come in arms upon his lands, he applied to pope Adrian to abſolve him from his oath. The requeſt being complied with, he marched againſt the duke, who being ſupported by the Greeks, was not eaſily conquered.

Pope John VIII being much diſtreſſed by the incurſions of the Saracens, in conſequence of a treaty they had made with Sergius duke of Naples, urged the Neapolitans to break that treaty; ſaying that ſuch a peace was a breach of the alliance made with Chriſt at their baptiſm. But the duke,

not-

notwithſtanding the excommunication of the pope, kept his faith with the Saracens. When, after this, his brother Athanaſius archbiſhop of Naples ſeized him, put out his eyes, and took poſſeſſion of the dukedom, the pope expreſſed his approbation of his conduct, praiſing him for loving God more than his brother, and for putting out the eye which ſcandalized the church. At laſt this pope, having no aſſiſtance from any prince, was himſelf obliged to make a treaty with the Saracens, engaging to pay them twenty-five thouſand marks of ſilver a year. Even in theſe circumſtances this pope kept urging the princes of Italy to break their treaties with the Saracens, and in A. D. 879 he excommunicated the people of Amalphi becauſe they would not do it. However, in conſequence of the pope's exhortations, Docibilis the governor of Gaieta did break his truce with them; on which many of the inhabitants were killed, and many taken priſoners. This obliged him to make a new treaty with them, by which they got an eſtabliſhment on the river Garillan, where they remained forty years, and did incredible miſchief.

Athanaſius abovementioned, whom the pope had praiſed for ſeizingthe poſſeſſions of his brother, and even putting out his eyes, finding it neceſſary to adhere to a treaty with the Saracens, the pope excommunicated him; and after he had continued

a year

a year in that ſtate, he ſubmitted, and was abſolved, on condition that, after ſending ſome of the priſoners (whoſe names were given him) to Rome, he ſhould put all the reſt to death; a condition of abſolution, as Fleury obſerves, not agreeable to the antient mildneſs of the church.

As the popes took advantage of circumſtances to advance their power, princes and biſhops did the ſame; and ſometimes they not only remonſtrated againſt their uſurpations with great freedom, but openly oppoſed them with ſucceſs.

At the requeſt of king Charles, the pope had got Vulfade archbiſhop of Bourges reſtored at the council of Soiſſons in A. D. 866, notwithſtanding the remonſtrances of Hincmar, after he had been degraded at a preceding council. On this occaſion Hincmar expoſtulated with the pope by means of the perſon who carried the decrees of the council to Rome; ſaying, that "if what they had done "before would not ſtand, neither would what "they had done then; that there would be nothing "to depend upon in the decrees of biſhops, or of "the popes; that excommunications would not "be regarded, and that the prieſts who were de-"poſed would not quit their functions, becauſe "our judgments, and thoſe of the holy ſee, fol-"low the wills of our kings, and the movements "of our paſſions."

In

In A. D. 864 pope Nicolas, in his council at Rome, condemned a council held at Metz in the year preceding, and depoſed Theugand archbiſhop of Treves, and Gonthier archbiſhop of Cologne, for having decided againſt his wiſhes in the cauſe of Lothaire and his wives. All the biſhops who joined with them in this buſineſs the pope alſo depoſed. They all, however, continued their functions, without any regard to the ſentence of the pope. The emperor who favoured them was ſo provoked at his conduct, that he went to Rome with a determination to compel him to reſtore the biſhops. And Gonthier wrote to all the biſhops in the dominion of Lothaire, deſiring them "not "to be diſturbed at the conduct of Nicolas, who "was called pope, and who conſidered himſelf as "an apoſtle among the apoſtles, making himſelf "emperor of all the world. Thanks to God," ſays he, "we have reſiſted his folly, and he re-"pents of what he has done." He then complains of the conduct of the pope for having condemned them unheard, and in an irregular manner, according to his fancy and tyrannical fury. Addreſſing himſelf to the pope, he ſays, "We will "not receive your accurſed ſentence; we deſpiſe "it as a calumny. We reject you from our com-"munion as communicating with thoſe who are "excommunicated, and content ourſelves with "com-

" communicating with all the churches, and the " ſociety of our brethren, whom you deſpiſe, and " of whom you render yourſelf unworthy by your " haughtineſs and arrogance."

The emperor went to Rome, and the pope fled to the church of St. Peter, where he paſſed two days without eating or drinking; but the emperor being ſeized with a fever he had a conference with the pope, and having ſettled matters with him, he conſented to the degradation of the two archbiſhops. Gonthier, however, ſent his proteſt to the pope, who not receiving it, his brother Hildwin by his orders went, and tho' a clergyman, in arms, and laid it on the tomb of St. Peter in the church dedicated to him. The guards reſiſting him, he oppoſed force to force, and killed one of them. The emperor ſuffered all this, and the perſons in his train were guilty of great diſorders, plundering and burning ſeveral houſes and churches, killing ſome men, and violating women, even nuns. Gonthier ſtill celebrated maſs, and conſecrated the chriſm, notwithſtanding the ſentence of the pope; but Theutgand abſtained from all eccleſiaſtical functions. Lothaire, however, whoſe intereſt it was not to offend the pope, refuſed to communicate with Gonthier, and depoſed him.

The

The council of Douzi in A. D. 871 having condemned Hincmar biſhop of Laon, he appealed to pope Adrian II, who ſummoned him to attend at Rome, with his accuſer, but king Charles wrote a ſpirited letter to the pope, denying his right to ſuch a power, but ſaying that, if he were at peace, he would himſelf attend at Rome, as the accuſer of Hincmar. The biſhops of this council, ſupported by the king, behaved with the ſame ſpirit; tho', as they informed the pope, they had read in this council the canons of the council of Sardica about appeals to the holy ſee? In theſe circumſtances the pope wrote a very ſubmiſſive letter to the emperor, promiſing that if Hincmar would come to Rome, he would ſend him back to be judged at home.

On the death of the emperor Lewis, in A. D. 874, pope John VIII, being gained by preſents, crowned Charles king of France emperor, tho' Lewis of Germany was the elder brother. Lewis, however, paid no regard to the pope, but endeavoured to maintain his right by force of arms. The death of Lewis ſoon after put an end to this conteſt. That which the ſame pope had with Lambert duke of Spoleto proceeded farther. Having a difference with the pope, he came to Rome with arms, and after committing great ravages in the neighbourhood, ſeized the gates of the city, and

making himſelf maſter of the pope's perſon, he kept him a priſoner, without ſuffering any perſon to come to him, or even carry him victuals, but after much intreaty. After he left the city the pope excommunicated him, with all his accomplices. This excommunication was repealed at the council of Troyes, where the pope was preſent in A. D. 878. What effect this meaſure had does not appear; but ſo much was ſaid about excommunications at the council of Ravenna in A. D. 877, that it is evident, ſays Fleury, they were now much deſpiſed. On this journey to France this pope was treated with little ceremony by the thieves of the country; for when he was at Chalons his horſes were ſtolen from him, and alſo a ſilver cup. He revenged himſelf as before by excommunicating the thieves, and all their accomplices.

Anſpert archbiſhop of Milan, without any regard to the excommunication publiſhed againſt him, at a council held by this pope at Rome, continued his functions, and the church of Verceil being vacant, he ordained one Joſeph a biſhop of it. The pope, however, declared the ordination null, and appointed another biſhop. Anſpert having agreed with the pope about the coronation of Charles le Gros, he was received into favour, and the pope even confirmed his ordination of Joſeph biſhop of Verceil to the biſhopric of Aſti.

Several

Several perſons held doctrines unfavourable to the pretenſions of the popes in ſpiritual as well as temporal matters. In the capitulary of Heyten biſhop of Baſle, the pilgrims who went to Rome were directed to confeſs before they ſet out, becauſe, he ſays, they ought to be bound or looſed by their own biſhops, and not by a ſtranger; meaning, ſays Fleury, the pope, as well as other foreign biſhops. Claudius of Turin maintained that the words of our Saviour to Peter had been miſunderſtood, that the power was only given to him while he was alive, and that the proper ſucceſſor of the apoſtle is not he who fills his ſee, but he who follows his example.

We ſhall not wonder at the oppoſition ſome of the popes met with, but rather that all reverence for the holy ſee was not wholly thrown off, if we attend to the character and conduct of ſome of them in this period. As an hiſtorian, I ſhall mention a few particulars of their violent and indecent behaviour.

Formoſus, a man of diſtinguiſhed abilities, and on that account tranſlated from the biſhopric of Porto to the ſee of Rome in A. D. 891, (which is the firſt inſtance of ſuch tranſlation to that ſee) after having been excommunicated by pope John VIII, and abſolved by Martin II, had an oppoñent in Sergius, who took part with Adelbert duke

of Tuſcany againſt Arnulph acknowledged to be emperor by Formoſus. After his death the Tuſcan party prevailed, and raiſed to the papacy Stephen VII biſhop of Anagni. This pope held a council, in which he produced the body of Formoſus, dreſſed in pontifical robes, with an advocate to plead his cauſe. Then, after addreſſing him as if he had been alive, they ſtripped him of his habit, cut off three of his fingers, and then his head, and laſtly threw the body into the Tiber. He then depoſed all who had been ordained by Formoſus, and ordained them again. This pope was, however, himſelf driven from the papal ſee, thrown into priſon, and ſtrangled. Romanus, who ſucceeded him in A. D. 897, having by means of ſome fiſhermen got the body of Formoſus, buried it in the ſepulchre of the popes, and the biſhops who had joined in the ſcandalous tranſaction reſpecting him were pardoned on their acknowledging that they did it by compulſion.

Leo V was expelled by Chriſtopher I; but both of them died in priſon. The laſt was ſucceeded by Sergius, who had oppoſed Formoſus, having been choſen pope by his party in A. D. 898 and expelled; but being elected again in A. D. 907, he conſidered John IX and the three ſucceeding popes as uſurpers. He, as might be expected, declared againſt Formoſus, and approved

of

of the conduct of Stephen with respect to him. In his time one Theodora, an impudent woman, absolutely governed the city of Rome. She had two daughters, Marozia and Theodora, more disorderly than herself. By the former of them pope Sergius had a son, John, who was afterwards pope, and by her husband Albert she had Alberic, who became master of Rome.

By the influence of Theodora, John, a clerc of Ravenna, with whom she had a criminal connection, and who was afterwards archbishop of Ravenna, was made pope in A. D. 914. This John X was thrown into prison by Gui the governor of Rome, and he died soon after, being supposed to be strangled. On the death of Stephen in A. D. 931, Marozia, then married to Gui the marquis of Tuscany, got her son by pope Sergius, then only twenty-five years old, to be made pope. He was John XI, but he was without authority, and only performed the ceremonies of religion. Shocked as we cannot but be by those enormities, we shall see greater in the succeeding periods of this history.

Between the pontificate of Leo IV who died A. D. 855, and that of Benedict III, it was long believed that a woman of the name of *Joan*, who had concealed her sex, was chosen pope. After the reformation this was the subject of much dispute, and at this day persons who have taken

much pains in the enquiry entertain doubts with reſpect to it, notwithſtanding Blondel, a learned Proteſtant; wrote to refute it. This hiſtory, if it were admitted, would not be ſo diſgraceful to the church as the conduct of ſeveral of the popes in this period.

I ſhall conclude this account of the popes of this period by obſerving, that Octavian, the ſon of Alberic, being made pope after the death of Agapit II in A. D. 954, changed his name to that of John XII, and was the firſt that did ſo.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Monks in this Period.

THE hiſtory of the monks is remarkable for periods of great relaxation of diſcipline, ſucceeded by periods of great rigour. Notwithſtanding the reformations of the two Benedicts, we find, in this age of general diſorder, much neglect and abuſe with reſpect to monaſteries, ſometimes occaſioned by the violence of foreign nations, as the Saracens, Normans and Huns, and ſometimes by the depredations of Chriſtian lords.

In conſequence of ſixty years civil wars, and the ravages of the Normans, the greater part of the monaſteries in France were ruined, many of the

the monks were killed, and the reſt being put to flight, led a vagabond diſorderly life. Some of the houſes, thus abandoned by the monks, were ſeized by the clergy, and others by the lay lords. In ſome caſes even the popes authorized the appropriation of the revenues of monaſteries for the uſe of lay perſons. Adrian II required Lothaire king of Lorrain to allow his wife Thetberge the abbeys which he had promiſed her for her royal maintenance; which, as Fleury ſays, was tacitly approving the abuſe of giving abbeys to ſecular perſons.

Before the reign of Alfred in England the monaſtic diſcipline was intirely neglected, owing to the frequent irruptions of the Danes, and the negligence of the Engliſh, ſo that no perſon of noble birth voluntarily became a monk; and tho' there were many monaſteries in the country, they were only filled with children, who lived without any regard to the rules of the place. On this account Alfred filled his new monaſtery of Altenay with foreign monks, eſpecially from France.

The reformation of monaſtic diſcipline in France was undertaken by William duke of Aquitain and Berry. He founded the monaſtery of Clugni in A. D. 910, and ſubjected it to the rules of Benedict, making the firſt abbot, Bernon, a perſon of a noble family in Burgundy, who was aſſiſted by Hugo from the monaſtery of Autun. At firſt Bernon

had no more than twelve monks, after the example of Benedict.

Bernon dying in A. D. 926, left the abbey of Clugni to his disciple Odo, the son of Abbon, a nobleman of great piety, who had distinguished himself by his austerities, and his application to learning in the monastery of St. Martin at Tours. Odo was forty years old when he was made abbot of Clugni, and from that time it began to be distinguished from all other monasteries by the exact observance of the rules, the emulation of virtue among the monks, the study of religion, and charity to the poor. Odo was employed to reform many other monasteries in France and Italy, being himself appointed abbot of them all, and making other persons his vicars. In his time the monastery of Clugni received so many donations, that it had an hundred and eighty-eight charters.

In the time of Odo the monastic discipline was restored in Belgic Gaul by Gerard of Brogne, descended of a noble family near Namur. He reformed more than eighteen monasteries; but before he died he appointed abbots in all the other monasteries, and confined himself to that of Brogne.

Another distinguished monk in this period was John, born at Vendieres between Metz and Toul, and afterwards abbot of Gorze, which had been ruined by the Normans; but at first he was only assistant

aſſiſtant to the abbot Einold in A. D. 933. Beſides giving great attention to the ſecular concerns of the abbey, he was aſſiduous in his application to literature.

The great reſtorer of the monkiſh diſcipline in England was Dunſtan. He was of a noble family, and was educated at Glaſtonbury, where at that time ſome Iriſhmen taught, but there were no monks, the kings having ſeized the domains. On the death of his parents, Dunſtan gave his eſtate to the monaſtery, and he reformed five monaſteries in other places. He was himſelf abbot of Glaſtonbury, which he built in a magnificent manner, and it became ſo much diſtinguiſhed for learning and piety, that a great number of biſhops and abbots were taken from it. Dunſtan was afterwards biſhop of Worceſter, then of Canterbury, and legate of the holy ſee. He was the reſtorer of letters as well as of monaſtic diſcipline. With his conduct as a politician, I have no occaſion to meddle.

In this period, as well as in the preceding, we find ſome, tho' not ſo many, examples of perſons in high ſtations retiring to monaſteries. Two ſiſters of William duke of Aquitain, being determined, according to the language of theſe times, to devote their virginity to God, begged of him to preſent them in form in the new church which he was

building as an oblation; which, says Fleury, is the first example of adult persons being presented by others. They formed a little convent themselves.

The same duke William, when in the highest favour with Charlemagne, and with every thing prosperous about him, devoted himself with peculiar solemnity to a monkish life at Gellene, and submitted to all the austerities of it. It is said that he made an hundred genuflexions every day before the altar, often plunged in the coldest water by way of purification before prayer; and to prepare himself for communion he sometimes used flagellation, administered in a private chamber by a confidential friend, in memory of our Saviour's passion. He lived this life seven years, dying in A. D. 812. The monastery of Gellene was from him called *St. William of the desert*.

The emperor Lothaire took the monastic habit before he died in A. D. 853, and so did Alphonsus IV king of Spain in A. D. 933.

It was not uncommon in this period to unite the two characters of bishop and monk. Rembert who succeeded Anscaire in the bishopricks of Hamburgh and Bremen, went after his consecration to the monastery of new Corbie, where he took the habit, and promised to observe the rules of Benedict, as much as his pastoral functions would permit;

mit; and for twenty-three years which he lived afterwards, he conformed to that ſtrict diſcipline, as much as if he had lived in a cloiſter. This, however, would not have been permitted in the Eaſt; for at a council held at Conſtantinople in A. D. 880, it was ordered that a biſhop becoming a monk ceaſed to be a biſhop.

Mention was made in the preceding period of the inſtitution of *canons* in cathedral churches by Chrodogand biſhop of Metz. In A. D. 816 a council was held at Aix la Chapelle, to make regulations for them, and the rules then agreed upon ſerved for many ages to diſtinguiſh canons from the reſt of the clergy. Among other things it was then ordered that the biſhop ſhould eſtabliſh an hoſpital to receive the poor, with a ſufficient revenue out of the funds of the church. To it the canons were to give the tythe of their income, even of the oblations; and one of them was to be the governor of it for the temporalities. At Chriſtmas at leaſt the canons were to waſh the feet of the poor, for which reaſon the hoſpital was to be ſo ſituated, that they might have eaſy acceſs to it. This, Fleury thinks, is the firſt certain origin of hoſpitals founded in cathedral churches, and ſuperintended by the canons. At the ſame time rules were laid down for *canoneſſes*, which much reſembled thoſe of the nuns. They were allowed

to

to have property, and even ſervants; but they were to eat in the ſame refectory, and ſleep in the ſame dormitory.

In this period we meet with a new variety in the monkiſh inſtitutions, viz. that of *recluſes* in monaſteries and nunneries. Theſe were perſons who ſhut themſelves up in particular cells annexed to monaſteries, after making a vow never to go out of them. No perſon, however, was permitted to take this vow, but after ſufficient trial, and with the permiſſion of the biſhop, or abbot, to which the monaſtery belonged. After obtaining this leave, the candidates paſſed a year of trial in the monaſtery; and in this time did not, on any pretenſe, go out of it. This term being expired, they took the vow of permanence in the church, in the preſence of the biſhop, and after the recluſe had entered his cell, the biſhop put his ſeal upon the door.

Theſe recluſes had within their cells every thing that was neceſſary for them. If they were prieſts, they had oratories conſecrated by the biſhop. The cells had windows looking into the church, thro' which the recluſe could give his offering for the maſſes, hear the ſinging, join in it, and anſwer to thoſe who ſpoke to him; but this window had curtains within and without, ſo that the recluſe could neither ſee, nor be ſeen. He had, however,

ever, a garden in which he could take the air and work. He had alſo a bath in his cell, which he could make uſe of whenever he thought proper; and this was thought to be neceſſary before communion. The recluſes were allowed to take what was voluntarily offered them, either for their own occaſions, or to give to the poor. If they were ſick, the door of the cell might be opened for any perſon to adminiſter to their relief; but they were not allowed to go out themſelves on any pretence whatever. Adjoining to theſe cells were others appropriated to the diſciples of the recluſes, with windows, by means of which they could either miniſter to them, or receive their inſtructions. Sometimes there were two or three cells of recluſes together, with ſuch windows of communication.

A prieſt of the name of Grimlaic, probably the perſon of that name who was favoured by pope Formoſus, drew up rules for theſe recluſes. Complaining of the diſorders of the times, he laments the languor of theſe recluſes. Their firſt concern, he ſays, was to inquire whether they would have every thing neceſſary for their ſubſiſtence. He particularly recommends to them bodily labour.

Nothing of any conſequence occurs in this period relating to the monks in the Eaſt. But we cannot doubt but that, from ſimilar cauſes, there were ſimilar complaints. Theodore Studita,

in

in an addreſs to the nuns, adviſes them not to lead the inſipid and relaxed lives of the generality of their profeſſion, who were nuns only in appearance.

We ſtill read of *Stilites*, or perſons who paſſed all their time on pillars in the open air, in this part of the world, tho' not in the Weſt. A perſon who was examined on the ſubject of the patriarch Ignatius, at the council in Conſtantinople in A. D. 870, mentioned his having made his confeſſion to one of theſe ſtilites. We alſo read of another, on whom St. Luke junr. attended in the middle of the tenth century.

SECTION IX.

Of the Superſtitions of this Period.

AS this was an age of great ignorance, we are not ſurprized that it abounded with *ſuperſtition*, to the injury of morality, on which it always encroaches. It appears by the decrees of the council of Chalons in A. D. 813, that ſome perſons committed ſins with a view to efface them by alms.

At the council of Arles in A. D. 813, it was ordered that the prieſts ſhould keep the chriſm under a ſeal, and not give it to any perſon as a medicine,

dicine, or on any other pretext whatever. For many perſons imagined that criminals who were either anointed with it, or who ſwallowed it, could not be diſcovered.

By pilgrimages it was thought that perſons obtained pardon for ſins paſt, and alſo to come. The moſt celebrated pilgrimages at this time were thoſe to Rome, and to St. Martin at Tours.

A notion ſtill more dangerous to morality, and yet very popular, prevailed at this time, viz. that the precepts of the goſpel were only deſigned for the monks, and the clergy. This was noticed, and condemned at a council held at Aix la Chapelle in A. D. 816.

Many of the firſt converts to Chriſtianity among the Danes did not chuſe to be baptized till near the time of their death, that they might go out of the world intirely pure. This has been obſerved to have obtained very much about the time of Conſtantine, who was himſelf influenced by it; but we do not read of it from that time to the preſent. In order to die with greater ſafety, many perſons in this age put on the monaſtic habit before they expired. When the emperor Lewis died in A. D. 840, a piece of the true croſs was laid on his breaſt. Indeed, it was natural to ſuppoſe that a relick would have as much virtue as the dreſs of a monk.

We

We cannot wonder that, in this age, many perſons ſhould be deſirous of being buried in churches; but as dead bodies in general were thought to defile conſecrated places, it was ordered in a council at Meaux in A. D. 849, that no perſon ſhould be buried in churches, but thoſe whom the biſhop ſhould think worthy of it, on account of their ſanctity.

In A. D. 827 there were ſeveral famous tranſlations of relicks; and many applications were made to Rome for them. Among others, particular application was made to the pope in A. D. 827 for the relicks of St. Sebaſtian for a monaſtery in France. The requeſt was with ſome difficulty granted; but it was ſaid that at the ſame time the perſons who had the charge of thoſe relicks, got poſſeſſion in a clandeſtine manner of thoſe of St. Gregory. Notwithſtanding this, the people of Rome pretend to have them both; ſo that, as Fleury ſays, the Romans either deceived the Franks, or gave them only part of the relicks. Nothing, ſays this writer, ſhews in a ſtronger light the devotion that was at this time paid to relicks, and how eagerly they were deſired, than the hiſtory of the tranſlation of ſome relicks by Eginhart the ſecretary of Charlemagne, which he gives at full length, with all the miracles that were ſaid to accompany the tranſlation of them. No

pains

pains or expence were ſpared in order to procure them, and ſome of the moſt enlightened perſons of the age laid the greateſt ſtreſs upon them. He acknowledges that much artifice was uſed in getting poſſeſſion of relicks, perſons ſtealing them from one anothor. With his uſual good ſenſe, he adds, "It was perhaps the ſame ſpirit which "led to the compoſition of ſo many hiſtories of "martyrs, and other ſaints, either to adorn and "amplify old ones, or to invent new ones, in "order to have legends for the feſtivals of ſaints "newly tranſlated."

It appears by the writings of Valafred Strabo, in the middle of the ninth century, that it was the cuſtom to bleſs a lamb brought near to the altar, in order to eat it on Eaſter day before any other victuals. The form of this benediction is at the end of the Roman miſſal. It is condemned by this Strabo as a remains of Jewiſh ſuperſtition.

At the coronation of Charles king of Lorrain, on the death of Lothaire in A. D. 869, Hincmar, who conſecrated him, mentioned for the firſt time that appears, the *holy oil* that was ſaid to have come down from heaven, with which he ſaid that Clovis had been anointed.

The ſame ideas which among other mortifications led to an entire abſtinence from marriage, led to reſtrictions in the number of marriages. By

many ſecond marriages were condemned, but third and fourth marriages were held in great abhorrence. Theſe ideas, however, were more prevalent in the Eaſt than in the Weſt. Leo, ſurnamed *the philoſopher*, having married a fourth wife, Zoe, the child he had by her, could not be baptized by the patriarch till he had promiſed to ſend her away. Zoe being after this received into the palace, all the people were ſcandalized at it, and the emperor engaged to have the validity of the marriage examined in a general council. Accordingly legates were ſent to Conſtantinople in A. D. 905 from all the patriarchal ſees, and the marriage was confirmed, but only by diſpenſation, that this caſe might not be drawn into a precedent. The patriarch, oppoſing the whole proceeding, was ſent out of the way.

The Weſt, however, was by no means free from ſuperſtition with reſpect to the commerce of the ſexes. Hermentrude, wife of Charles king of Bretagne, having loſt ſome children, and others having become monks, the king requeſted the biſhops aſſembled in council in A. D. 866 to give her their benediction, that ſhe might have other children uſeful to the church and the ſtate. Accordingly, ſhe was crowned by them, and that oration was pronounced over her which is at the end of the maſs of marriage.

Ideas

Ideas of ſome impurity attending the moſt lawful commerce of the ſexes were univerſal. Pope Nicolas giving inſtructions to the king of Bulgaria, who was lately become a Chriſtian, directs that men abſtain from any commerce with their wives in lent, on ſundays, and as long as they gave ſuck.

In one reſpect we perceive the decreaſe of ſuperſtition in this period. Charlemagne had ordered that if there ſhould be any difference among his ſons about the limits of their kingdoms, it ſhould be decided by the judgment of the croſs, without having recourſe to arms. But the emperor Lewis forbad the trial by the croſs. And Agobard biſhop of Lyons wrote againſt all appeals to God by ordeals or duel.

SECTION X.

Of the diſorderly State of this Period.

THE civil ſtate of the world is no proper part of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, and therefore I ſhall not dwell upon it, but the diſorders of this period are ſo prominent a feature of it, that they cannot be paſſed without notice. Beſides, they had a great connection with the affairs of the

church. In no period whatever does it appear that the inhabitants of the antient Weſtern Roman empire ſuffered more, partly from the invaſions of foreign nations, and partly from violences committed among themſelves. The invaſions of the Saracens, the Normans, the Danes, and the Huns, were almoſt conſtant, and moſt dreadful.

The Saracens, beſides keeping poſſeſſion of the greater part of Spain, and being generally at war with the Chriſtian princes of it, frequently invaded other countries, eſpecially the coaſts of Italy, on which they had for ſome time conſiderable eſtabliſhments. In A. D. 884 they deſtroyed the monaſtery of Mount Caſſin, and often threatened Rome itſelf. In A. D. 846 they plundered the Vatican, which was then contiguous to the city, and is now a part of it, and carried away much wealth. *Sueur.* Wherever they came, the churches and monaſteries were a conſtant object of plunder. They were a rich and an eaſy prey.

The Normans committed ſtill greater ravages, not only in the North of France, where they at length obtained a permanent ſettlement, but even in the South. They even infeſted the coaſts of Italy, and in A. D. 859 took Piſa and other cities. Theſe ravages, in which the total deſtruction of churches and monaſteries, was moſt dreadful, continued ſeventy years, when they ſettled in the province

vince ſince called *Normandy*, and their duke Rollo making peace with Charles ſurnamed *the Simple*, embraced Chriſtianity in A. D. 912. Being baptized himſelf, he ordered all his counts, knights, and his whole army, to be baptized. Rollo's becoming a Chriſtian was one article in the treaty. In this manner was Chriſtianity propagated in thoſe times.

In A. D. 900 the Huns made an irruption into Italy, and among other ravages deſtroyed the monaſteries of Nonantula, in the territory of Modena. In A. D. 924, being invited by Berenger, they again entered Italy, when they ravaged Lombardy, took Pavia, and burned forty-three churches.

But, upon the whole, it ſeems probable that France in particular ſuffered as much from the want of an efficient government, and a due ſubordination among the different members of the ſtate. For all the great lords or landholders, were independent of one another, and almoſt ſo upon the king; ſo that they were frequently at war with one another. Conſequently travelling was very hazardous, and all that the kings or the biſhops could do to reſtrain theſe diſorders had little effect. In thoſe times, there being no regular adminiſtration of juſtice, the lords were obliged to do themſelves juſtice by force of arms. Gerault count of Aurillac, who for his piety and application to literature

terature obtained the title of ſaint, was obliged to do the ſame, acting the part of thoſe who were afterwards ſtiled *knights errant*, who fought to redreſs public wrongs. His hiſtorian ſaid, that he uſed as much moderation as he poſſibly could avoiding the ſhedding of blood, and treating his priſoners with generoſity.

In a council, or parliament, held by Charles the Bald in A. D. 862, many directions were given to reſtrain the diſorders of the times; but Fleury ſays they were ſo little obſerved, that they rather ſerved to ſhew the greatneſs of the evil, than to remedy it. At the council of Mayence in A. D. 888, great complaints were made of the diſtreſs of the times, of the deſtruction of churches and monaſteries, of the murder of prieſts and monks, of whole troops of perſons who lived by plunder, and of ſchiſmatics, who made no account of murder and rapine, and would not ſubmit to any penance.

Hincmar, in an addreſs to king Charles, complains of all kinds of crimes being committed with impunity by the lords, and as they generally went out of the church before the communion, he prepared an addreſs to be read to them in all the churches of his dioceſe before that time. Among other complaints, he ſays that, after getting from the churches all the proviſions they could conſume, they demanded money, and if it was not granted,

they

they committed greater waſte. Even the clergy who attended the court ſuffered their domeſtics to commit theſe diſorders, to maintain their horſes and ſervants, and to abuſe the women they met with. Hubert, brother of queen Thetberge, who had been in holy orders, giving himſelf up to debauchery, committed many violences. He ſeized on the monaſtery of St. Maurice in Valois, and employed the revenues of it in the maintenance of his women, dogs, and hawks. He alſo entered with an armed force into the monaſtery of Luxieu, and there lived ſome days with his women. John VIII having complained of the injuries he had received from Lambert duke of Spoleto at the council of Troyes in A. D. 878, all the biſhops ſaid, "We wiſh to know how to act ourſelves, for "all our churches are plundered."

Even the perſons of the clergy were not ſpared in the violence of theſe times. Fulk archbiſhop of Rheims having a quarrel with Baldwin count of Flanders, the vaſſals of the count met the archbiſhop as he was going to the king in A. D. 900, and murdered him. Three of the vaſſals of Baldwin were ſolemnly excommunicated on this occaſion, and the biſhops, in pronouncing the curſes, threw lamps from their hands, and extinguiſhed them; which Fleury ſays is the firſt example that

he had met with of ſuch a mode of excommunication.

The election of a new pope was at this time, and has in ſome degree continued ever ſince, to be a ſeaſon of diſorder in Rome. When Stephen was elected pope in A. D. 885, the ſacriſty was plundered, ſo that there were hardly veſſels enow left for the ſolemn feſtivals. Every thing elſe was completely gone, and little left in the treaſury of the church. In a council held by John IX, complaint was made that, on the death of a pope, it was grown into a cuſtom to plunder the patriarchal palace, that the plunder extended thro' the city of Rome, and the ſuburbs, and that all pontifical houſes were treated in the ſame manner on the death of a biſhop.

The great wealth of churches and monaſteries, which were of little apparent uſe in a civil reſpect, furniſhed an excuſe to the laity for ſeizing upon them. When an inquiry was made by the emperor Lewis, in an aſſembly held at Aix la Chapelle in A. D. 828, into the cauſes of the diſorders of the times, and the biſhops complained of the ſeizing of their temperalities, the lords replied, that the ſtate was ſo much weakened by donations to the church, that without its aſſiſtance it could not be ſupported. However, from a letter of the biſhops of France to king Lewis in A. D. 858, ſaid

to

to be written by Hincmar, it appears that the rich biſhopricks were given to freemen to ſtrengthen the militia of the kingdom, and thereby to procure a defence for the church. This, ſays Fleury, was the origin of fiefs dependant upon churches.

In the ſecond council of Aix, in A. D. 836, the clergy ſtrongly remonſtrated againſt the conduct of king Pepin, in uſurping the goods of the church, on the pretence that there was no harm in making uſe of them in caſe of neceſſity; that neither God nor the ſaints wanted them, that every thing is God's, and he has made them for the uſe of man. They ſhewed him, however, that God accepts the offerings of men, and that he has given them to his ſervants the prieſts. In conſequence of this remonſtrance, orders were given at this time for the reſtitution of all uſurpations.

The popes themſelves were ſometimes guilty of theſe violences. When the emperor Lothaire was at Rome in A. D. 824, the abbot of Farfa complained to him that, to the prejudice of his monaſtery, the pope had impoſed a tribute upon it, and had taken away ſome lands by violence. The complaint appearing to be juſt, reſtitution was ordered to be made.

Such diſorders as thoſe mentioned in this ſection were as common in Bretagne as in France

properly ſo called, and as common in England, as in any other country.

SECTION XI.

Miſcellaneous Articles.

I SHALL begin this ſection with the notice of ſuch articles as relate the ordinances of the church, and public worſhip.

1. It appears from the treatiſes on baptiſm, written at the requiſition of Charlemagne, that the adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper immediately followed the baptiſm of infants. At a council in England in A. D. 817, it was ordered that baptiſm ſhould not be adminiſtered by affuſion, but by dipping the whole body of the child three times.

2. At a council of Mayence in A. D. 813, it was ordered that no prieſt ſhould ſay maſs alone; for that otherwiſe he could not ſay *the Lord be with us.* Solitary maſſes were alſo forbidden at the council of Paris in A. D. 829.

3. The recital of the Nicene creed in the public worſhip became more common after the condemnation of Felix of Urgel.

4. Pope John VIII, writing to the Moravians, ordered them to recite the maſs in Latin or Greek,

Greek, and not, as he had heard they did, in the Sclavonian tongue, tho' they might preach in that language. "All the world," he says, "recites "the mass in Latin, or Greek," not knowing, as Fleury observes, that the Syrians, Egyptians, and Armenians, all recited the office in their own tongues. Afterwards, being probably convinced by the remonstrances of Methodius, who went from thence to Rome, he made no objection to the whole service being performed in Sclavonic. Still, however, he recommended the reading of the gospels in Latin first.

5. At the council of Paris in A. D. 829, great complaint was made of the priests, who thro' ignorance prescribed penance from books called *Penitentials*, which were of no authority, and which were ordered to be collected, and burned. By this means very light penances had been appointed for great crimes. Halitgarius, bishop of Arras and Cambray, who assisted at this council, was requested to compose a treatise from the Fathers, and the canons of the church, to serve instead of those Penitentials. He undertook it, and called his book *A remedy for sins.* Before this period there was no penance but what was in public, for offences known to the world; but now another kind of penance was introduced for secret sins. *Sueur.* A. D. 813.

6. It

6. It was not till the council of Lateran under Innocent III that *auricular confeſſion* was made neceſſary; but in the ninth century private penance enjoined by the prieſt was pretty common. *Bingham*, Vol. 2. p. 22.

7. About A. D. 890 the council of Nante ordered the preſbyters to keep ſome part of the oblations of the people till after the ſervice, that ſuch as were not prepared to communicate might on every feſtival, and on the Lord's day, receive ſome of this bread (called *eulogia*) when bleſſed in a proper manner. *Bingham*, Vol. 1. p. 770.

8. In A. D. 835 Gregory IV dedicated the Pantheon (which had before been dedicated to the virgin Mary and the martyrs) to all the ſaints. He alſo inſtituted the feſtival of *All Saints*. He wrote to the emperor Lewis on the occaſion, and he, with the conſent of the biſhops of France, ordered it to be celebrated the firſt of November thro' all his dominions, according to the direction of the pope. *Sueur*.

9. Hereditary ſepulchres in churches were not allowed in the ninth century, but were introduced by the papal decretals. For a decree of Leo III was inſerted in his decretals by Gregory IX, giving a ſort of hereditary right to all perſons to be buried in the ſepulchres of their anceſtors. *Bingham*, Vol. 2. p. 426.

10. In

10. In the acts of the council of Meaux in A. D. 845 we find a diſtinction made between ſimple excommunication, and an anathema.

11. Early in the ninth century there was a diſpute between the French and Roman ſingers; and an appeal being made to Charlemagne, he decided in favour of the Roman, and got the pope to ſend him ſingers to teach the Roman method in France. *Williams* p. 36.

In the tenth century Dunſtan was the patron of ſcience and the arts in England, and among the reſt of muſic, in which he was a proficient. It is ſaid that he preſented the abbey of Malmſbury with an organ, perhaps the firſt that was ſeen in England, and that he caſt two of the bells of Abingdon abby with his own hands. *Williams*, p. 36.

12. The general ſtate of literature is intimately connected with eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, and therefore I ſhall not fail to note whatever I find of importance relating to it.

It is ſaid that Charlemagne requeſted his biſhops to write treatiſes on the ſubject of baptiſm, not for his own information ſo much as theirs; for he was continually exciting the prelates to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, the clergy in general to the obſervance of their diſcipline, the monks to regularity, the grandees to give good council, the judges to do juſtice, the ſuperiors to humility, the inferiors

inferiors to obedience, and all to virtue and concord. This is, in the ſtyle of panegyric; but it was probably in a great meaſure true of that extraordinary man. But the effects of all that he did for the advancement of learning were but temporary. For at a council held in Rome in A. D. 826, thirty-eight canons were made, the object of moſt of which was the reformation of the clergy, whoſe ignorance is ſaid to have been very great, and therefore ſchools were directed to be eſtabliſhed in cathedral churches and pariſhes. In the reign of Charles the Bald, at the council of Langres in A. D. 859, there was great complaint made of the want of public ſchools, and that, in conſequence of this, there hardly remained a trace of the knowledge of the ſcriptures. This prince, however, is praiſed for having in ſome meaſure reſtored letters, having procured learned men from all countries, and among others from Ireland. He had a ſchool in his palace.

In England Alfred diſtinguiſhed himſelf not only by his excellent civil inſtitutions, but alſo by his zeal to promote literature. He is conſidered as the founder of the univerſity of Oxford. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 113.

Literature had alſo been much neglected at Conſtantinople in ſeveral reigns preceding that of Michael in A. D. 858, when his uncle Bardas promoted

promoted the revival of it, in which he was assisted by Leo surnamed the *Philosopher*, who had been archbishop of Thessalonica, and had been deposed as an Iconoclast, and by Photius the learned patriarch of Constantinople.

13. In this period we find the first mention of *coloured glass* in the windows of churches. Pope Leo III ornamented a church in Rome with glass of this kind.

14. As a specimen of the fabulous legends which abounded in this age of ignorance and superstition, I shall relate what Hildwin abbot of St. Denis, at the request of the emperor Lewis, collected concerning St. Dionysius, from whom the monastery had its name. In this history he says the first bishop of Paris was Dionysius the Areopagite, who was converted by St. Paul, and was the author of the writings then usually ascribed to him. After having for some years governed the church of Athens, he put another person in his place, and travelled to Rome, in order to see Peter and Paul; but did not arrive there till after their martyrdom under the pontificate of St. Clement, who sent him as an apostle into Gaul, with several persons to accompany him. After arriving at Arles, Dionysius went to Paris, then a royal city, and famous for the assemblies of Gauls and Germans. There he built a church, and ordained clergy,

clergy, converted a number of infidels, and wrought many miracles. The emperor Domitius, hearing of this, ſent into Gaul a governor called Feſcennius Siſinius, who arriving at Paris cauſed biſhop Dionyſius to be apprehended, together with the archprieſt Ruſticus, and the archdeacon Eleutherus, and made them ſuffer many torments. Dionyſius was ſcourged, laid on a gridiron, thrown to the wild beaſts, after that into a furnace, faſtened to a croſs, and then ſent back to priſon, together with many other Chriſtians; where, as he was celebrating maſs, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf appeared with ſeveral angels, and gave them the euchariſt with his own hands. At length theſe three ſaints were conducted to Montmartre, where their heads were cut off before the idol Mercury. Many others ſuffered martyrdom along with them, but the body of Dionyſius got up, and took his head in his hands, being conducted by angels. Laſtly, a lady named Catula had the three bodies taken out of the Seine, into which the pagans had thrown them, and buried them in a field where the church and monaſtery now ſtand. After this my readers will excuſe me, if I paſs over a thouſand other legends ſimilar to this in ſilence.

PERIOD

PERIOD XVII.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF OTHO IN A. D. 936 TO THE CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM BY THE CRUSADERS IN A. D. 1099.

SECTION I.

Of the State of the Papacy in this Period.

IN order to give a juſt idea of the wretched ſtate to which the papacy was ſunk in the greateſt part of this period, it will be neceſſary to give a ſketch of the hiſtory of ſeveral of the popes, and of the principal tranſactions of the times; but this ſhall be as ſuccinct as I can well make it.

Otho king of Germany, being invited to Italy by pope John XII, to relieve him from the tyranny of Berenger king of Italy, was by him crowned emperor in A. D. 960; and in return he reſtored to the pope all that had been taken from the ſee of Rome in every part of Italy. He alſo promiſed him Sicily, if he ſhould be able to conquer it from the Saracens; reſerving, however, the

ſovereignty of all the ſtates to himſelf and his heirs. Afterwards the pope joined Adelbert the ſon of Berenger; but flying from Rome on the approach of Otho, and being accuſed of many crimes in a council held in A. D. 963, he was depoſed, and Leo VIII choſen in his place.

John's party prevailing again, he depoſed Leo, who fled to the emperor; and to ſatiate his revenge John ordered the right hand of another John, a cardinal deacon and a partiſan of Leo, to be cut off, and alſo the tongue, noſe, and two fingers of Azon his chief ſecretary. Then, in a council held in Rome, Leo was declared to be an uſurper, and John, after depoſing all who had been ordained by him, reordained them. John ſurvived this council only three months. For being in company with a common proſtitute without the gates of Rome, he received ſo violent a blow on the temples, that he died in eight days, and, as the hiſtorian ſays, without receiving the viaticum. He was ſucceeded by Benedict V. but the people of Rome, who oppoſed the entrance of Otho, being preſſed by famine, gave up the pope; and Leo VIII, who had been depoſed by John, was reinſtated; and in another council Benedict was degraded and baniſhed.

On the death of John XIII, in A. D. 972, Benedict VI was made pope, but becoming odi-

ous

ous to the Romans, he was seized by Crescentius the son of John X, by Theodora, and confined in the castle of St. Angelo. Francon, called Boniface VII was made pope in his place, and some time after Benedict was strangled in prison. After his death Boniface was expelled, and fled to Constantinople; but returning after the death of Benedict, in A. D. 984, and his party gaining the ascendancy, they seized his successor John XIV, and confined him in the castle of St. Angelo, where he died of hunger and vermin. When he was dead, his own friends disliked him so much, that they pierced his body with lances, dragged it by the feet, and left it exposed in the open street.

Such is the complexion of the papal history in this period, mentioned with horror and disgust by all the Catholic historians; and in the same light it was viewed by pious and intelligent persons at the time. Arnold bishop of Orleans, at a council, in which the archbishop of Rheims was tried for high treason, and it was proposed to appeal to the pope, after reciting the history of the late popes, said, "Is it then determined that so many bishops, "distinguished by their learning and their virtue "in all parts of the world, should be subject to "such monsters, full of infamy, and void of know-"ledge of things divine or human? Whom are "we to blame that the principal church, formerly

"crowned with honour and glory, is now ſo de-
"baſed, and loaded with infamy? The fault is
"ours. It is becauſe we ſeek our own intereſts,
"and not thoſe of Jeſus Chriſt." He then ſaid they were to blame in not making a proper choice of popes. What," ſaid he, "can we think of a man "ſitting on a high throne, clothed in gold and "purple if he be deſtitute of charity, and only "puffed up with knowledge? It is antichriſt ſit-"ting in the temple of God and ſhewing himſelf "as God: but if he have neither charity nor ſci-"ence, he is in the temple of God as an idol, and "to conſult him is to conſult the marble." He therefore recommends an appeal to the biſhops of the neighbouring provinces rather than to Rome, where, he ſays, every thing is venal, and all judgments ſold by the weight of gold. He clearly proved, ſays Fleury, that according to antient cuſtom, appeals ſhould not have been made to Rome, but that he was embarraſſed by the ſpurious decretals, which he could not diſtinguiſh. But to proceed with my ſketch of the hiſtory.

John XIX was a mere layman, who got himſelf made pope by the force of money. At the ſolicitation of the emperor Baſilius he would for a bribe have conſented that the patriarch of Conſtantinople ſhould have the title of univerſal biſhop of the Eaſt, as he had that of the whole church, but the alarm it gave prevented his doing it. On

On the death of this John, a ſon of Alberic count of Tuſculum, who was only twelve years of age, was made pope by the name of Benedict IX, and he continued eleven years, diſhonouring the ſee by his infamours life. Simony then reigned at Rome, Fleury ſays for twenty five years. This pope making himſelf infamous by his rapines and murders, the Roman people were unable to bear him any longer, and expelled him from Rome A. D. 1044, making John biſhop of Sabine pope, by the name of Silveſter III. Benedict, however, by the help of his relations, forced his way into the city; but continuing his ſcandalous life, and ſeeing himſelf deſpiſed by the clergy and people, he agreed to withdraw for a ſum of money. He, however, aſſumed the papacy the third time in A. D. 1047, and held it more than eight months, when Fleury ſays, being touched with repentance, he finally abdicated.

Alexander II, being choſen pope without waiting for the conſent of the court of Henry IV, then a child, they made Henry biſhop of Parma pope, by the name of Honorius II. He marched towards Rome with an army, but was repulſed, and was afterwards depoſed by all the biſhops of Germany and Italy, A. D. 1062. He was, however, ſupported by Godfrey duke of Lorrain and Tuſcany, who had at firſt oppoſed him; but notwith-

ſtanding this, at the council of Mantua Alexander ſatisfied the people of Lombardy with reſpect to the validity of his election, and Honorius was condemned as a ſimoniac. Not diſcouraged with this, Honorius entered Rome by ſurpriſe, and ſeized the church of St. Peter; but being overpowered, he took refuge in the caſtle of St. Angelo, where he continued two years. Eſcaping thence, he retired to mount Bardon near Baretti, where he continued to act as pope as long as he lived, and when excommunicated himſelf, he excommunicated his opponents.

But by far the moſt intereſting part of the papal hiſtory in this period is that of Gregory VII, and his conteſt with the emperor Henry IV, which I ſhall therefore relate at ſome length.

This famous pope, under the name of Hildebrand, had, with great ability, activity and integrity, directed the moſt important affairs of the papacy under ſeveral of the preceding popes, and as far as appears, was a man of an irreproachable moral character. He was a great enemy of Simony, the prevailing complaint of the times, but he had unfortunately entertained the moſt extravagant ideas of the papal power, as ſuperior to any other in the world; and acting upon them, he involved himſelf in inextricable difficulties, and was the occaſion of

much

much miſchief, by being the occaſion of a civil war in Germany and Italy.

Henry IV too much reſembled other princes of this time, being equally deſſolute and rapacious; and tho' he was induced to make ſome mean ſubmiſſions, he was a prince of great courage and reſolution, and in more favourable circumſtances might have appeared to conſiderable advantage.

The firſt occaſion of this prince's unfortunate conteſt with the church was his deſire to get rid of his queen Bertha. Alleging for an excuſe, that he had not been able to conſummate his marriage with her, he applied to the biſhops for a divorce, and they applying to the pope, he ſent St. Damien with his orders, expreſſing his ſtrong diſapprobation of the propoſal, and declaring that he would not give him the imperial crown if he betrayed the cauſe of religion in ſo ſhameful a manner. The lords approving of the pope's ſentence, the king was obliged to comply, and keep his wife, tho' he never lived with her as ſuch.

Another offence of this king was his ſale of church livings. He encouraged the archbiſhop of Mayence in exacting the tithes of Thuringia, promiſing him his aſſiſtance, on condition that he ſhould ſhare them with him. The archbiſhop conſented, and at the council of Erford, all the biſhops had been gained to give their conſent;

and by the king's management no appeal was made to the pope on the ſubject. Being, however, accuſed of ſelling his church livings, the pope excommunicated him, and moreover ſent legates into Germany to preſide at a council which was to be held on the ſubject. This the biſhops oppoſed; ſaying, that their own metropolitan ſhould preſide, unleſs the pope was preſent in perſon. And Fleury ſays the preſiding of the popes' legates in councils was then a novelty. They, therefore, returned without holding the council, but they carried letters from the king, in which he expreſſed his entire ſubmiſſion to the pope, acknowledging his offences, and eſpecially that of ſelling his church livings. This, however, did not ſatisfy the haughty prelate. For when Henry was celebrating the feſtival of chriſtmas at Goſlar in A. D. 1075, he ſent a legate to order him to attend at Rome, the ſecond week in lent, to defend himſelf againſt ſeveral things that were laid to his charge; threatening that, otherwiſe, he would again excommunicate him. This was more than a young and high ſpirited prince could bear. Being exceedingly provoked at this conduct, he appointed a meeting of the biſhops and abbots of his kingdom at Worms, the 23d of January, with a view to conſult about depoſing the pope.

To

To this Henry might be encouraged by the appearance of other enemies to the pope. Cencius, the prefect of Rome, a man abandoned to all wickedneſs, having been often reproved by Gregory without any effect, was at length excommunicated. On this he went to conſult with Robert Guiſcard, and others, in the ſame ſtate of excommunication, to concert meaſures for ſeizing the pope; and at chriſtmas in A. D. 1075 Cencius did ſeize the pope as he was performing maſs. He was even dragged by the hair, and received a dangerous wound in the forehead, from a man who intended to have killed him. The people, however, riſing in favour of the pope, Cencius retired to a caſtle which he had built in the city; and aſking the pope's pardon, was admitted to penance, but leſt he ſhould be taken, he fled.

About the ſame time Guibert archbiſhop of Ravenna concerted with the archbiſhop of Milan, and other biſhops of Lombardy, which was ſubject to the king, and in a ſtate of revolt, and they employed cardinal Hugh, ſurnamed *the White*, who had been depoſed by the pope for his diſorderly conduct, to excite Robert Guiſcard and king Henry againſt the pope, both ſufficiently diſpoſed to it.

Surrounded by ſo many enemies, the pope ſeems to have been deſirous of accommodating mat-

ters with the king, He wrote to him to expoſtulate with him on his conduct, and without any acrimony. It was, however, without effect. For Henry perſiſting in his purpoſe, did not fail to go to Worms at the time appointed, and there he was met by a great number of biſhops and abbots, together with cardinal Hugh. There the king recited an account which he had drawn up of the life, education, and behaviour of the pope, calculated to excite the indignation of his audience. To encourage them in their oppoſition to him, he informed them, that he had made himſelf many enemies, the Normans, the neighbouring counts, and many of the people of Rome. After ſome oppoſition from Adalberon biſhop of Virſburgh, and Herman biſhop of Metz, on account of the perſon accuſed being abſent, it was unanimouſly determined that Hildebrand was no proper pope, and that he had not the power of binding or looſing.

The biſhops of Lombardy alſo, and thoſe in the march of Ancona, aſſembled at Pavia, and all ſigned the condemnation of the pope, ſwearing on the evangeliſts that they would no more acknowledge him as ſuch, and they ſent deputies who took the ſame oath of others. It does not appear, however, that either at Worms or Pavia, any ſpecific charge was brought againſt the pope. Henry's ſpeech was only general invective, except that he

ſaid

ſaid that there was ſome irregularity in his election; but whatever it was, it had been confirmed and ſanctioned by himſelf.

Henry alſo wrote to the clergy and people of Rome, adviſing them of what had been done, charging Gregory with enmity to himſelf, and as having declared that he would either die or deprive him of his kingdom, and even of his life, and deſiring them to chuſe another pope. He likewiſe wrote to the pope himſelf, reproaching him with the contempt with which he had treated the biſhops, and ſaying that he held his kingdom not of the pope, but of God only, and that he could not be depoſed unleſs he abandoned the faith; ſo, at leaſt, ſays Fleury, the biſhops who compoſed the letter, ſaid for him.

Roland, a clergyman of Parma, was the bearer of this letter, and of another from the council, and they were delivered at the opening of Gregory's council in Rome the firſt week in Lent. Such, however, was the indignation of thoſe who attended that council, that it was not without difficulty, and by means of the interpoſition of Gregory himſelf, that Roland eſcaped with his life. Had this pope always ſpoken and acted as he did on this occaſion, he would have been great indeed. When Roland was ſafe, he addreſſed the council with moderation and dignity, becoming a chriſtian biſhop.

"Theſe

" Theſe," ſaid he, " are the *perilous times*, which " the ſcriptures ſay ſhould come. Offences will " come, and we muſt be as ſheep among wolves. " Let us then, without hating any perſon, bear " with theſe madmen who violate the laws of God. " I have in my hand a ſign of the victory which " God will give to his church ;" and with this he exhibited an egg, or ſomething in the form of an egg, which had been found in the church of St. Peter, round which he ſaid a ſerpent, armed with a ſword and helmet, was ſeen endeavouring to get to the top, but was not able to do it. " We muſt " now" he ſaid, " employ the ſword of the word, " to bruiſe the head of the ſerpent, and avenge the church." All preſent applauded the ſpeech of the pope, declared that they were ready to die in ſo good a cauſe, and concluded with ſaying, that Henry ſhould be deprived of his royal dignity, and anathematized, together with his abettors.

The day following the pope pronounced againſt the king a ſolemn ſentence of depoſition, in the form of an addreſs to the apoſtle Peter, as head of the church. " I forbid," he ſaid " Henry " ſon of the emperor Henry, who by unheard of " pride has raiſed himſelf againſt your church, to " govern the kingdoms of Germany and Italy. I " abſolve the chriſtians from the oath they have " taken or ſhall take to him, and I forbid any per-

" ſon

" ſon to ſerve him as king. For he who will at-
" tack the authority of your church, deſerves to loſe
" the dignity with which he is inveſted." He alſo pronounced excommunications againſt the biſhops of Germany in general, and thoſe who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves the moſt in this oppoſition to him by name. He treated in the ſame manner the biſhops of Lombardy. After this, Gregory addreſſed a letter to all the faithful, imploring their aſſiſtance in the defence of the church. " If,' ſays he, " you believe that St. Peter has received from
" Chriſt the keys of the kingdom of heaven, you
" are not worthy to partake of his glory in heaven,
" if you do not take part of his ſufferings below."

In the mean time Guibert archbiſhop of Ravenna, ſome time after Eaſter aſſembled the biſhops of Lombardy; when they again excommunicated the pope. But the lords were divided on the ſubject, thinking that the pope could not be judged by any perſon. Many perſons in Germany and Italy ſaid the ſame with reſpect to the king. But, in anſwer to this, Gregory, in a letter to Herman biſhop of Metz, who had returned to his obedience after having taken part with Henry, ſaid, " Per-
" haps it will be ſaid that when Chriſt bad Peter
" feed his ſheep, he excepted kings; but in giving
" him the power of binding and looſing, it is
" plain that he excepted no perſon; and if the holy

" ſee

"ſee has received from God the power of judging "in ſpiritual things, why ſhall ſhe not alſo judge "in things temporal. Perhaps it will be ſaid that "the royal dignity is above the epiſcopal, but the "difference may be ſeen in the origin of both. "The former was the invention of human pride, "whreas the latter is an inſtitution of divine good-"neſs; and therefore St. Ambroſe ſays, that the "epiſcopacy is ſuperior to royalty, as much as "gold is ſuperior to lead, and the emperor Con-"ſtantine took the laſt place among the biſhops."

This letter is dated Auguſt 24, A. D 1076. In it, ſays Fleury, we ſee the foundation of a doctrine unheard of before, viz. that the pope has a right to depoſe ſovereigns. At the ſame time he addreſſed a long letter to the biſhops and the people of Germany, vindicating his conduct towards the king, from his total diſregard of his repeated admonitions; taking it for granted that what he had done in conſequence of it was right. In another letter he urges them to chuſe another king, if Henry did not ſubmit to the authority of the church; but in this caſe he ſaid that he muſt be conſulted, as well as Agnes the king's mother.

In this ſtate of things many deſerted the part of the king, even ſome of thoſe who joined in the excommunication of the pope; and confeſſing their fault they were received into favour; while others urged

urged the king to take his revenge for the inſult. But at this juncture, the formidable ſtate of the king's enemies made this very hazardous. At the head of them were Rudolph duke of Suabia, Guelf duke of Bavaria, Adalberon biſhop of Virſburgh Adalbert biſhop of Worms, and many others; who having met at Ulm, appointed another meeting at Tribur near Mayence, when all who wiſhed well to the ſtate ſhould conſider of the remedies to be applied for the diſorders of it. Accordingly, the lords of Suabia and Saxony met there in great numbers, when they determined to depoſe Henry and elect another king. There were alſo two legates from the pope at this meeting; one of whom, Altman of Paſſau, having been expelled by the king, went to the pope, and having formally renounced his biſhoprick, on a pretended ſcruple for having received the inveſtiture at the hands of a layman, had been reinſtated by the pope.

Henry, who was not far from the place of this meeting, being greatly alarmed at their proceedings, ſent ſo them to make many conceſſions, even to abandon the governmcnt, and to retain only the outward badge of royalty; but even this was not deemed ſufficient. They propoſed to refer his ſentence to the pope, who was to be at Augſburgh at the feſtival of the purification of the virgin Mary; and declared that, if he was not abſolved from his excom-

excommunication within a year and a day they ſhould conſider themſelves as no longer bound by the allegiance they had ſworn to him. To theſe hard conditions, the king, ſeeing no remedy, conſented.

Alarmed at this oppoſition, and determined if poſſible, to get the excommunication taken off before the time fixed for it was expired, Henry undertook a journey to Italy, tho' it was in the midſt of winter, accompanied by his wife and his ſon yet an infant. Being arrived in Lombardy, where the people were irritated againſt the pope, he was ſoon ſurrounded by a conſiderable army, hoping that he would depoſe the pope. He himſelf, however, ſaw the neceſſity he was under, on account of the ſtate of things in Germany, to perſiſt in his purpoſe, and therefore proceeded to meet the pope, who was then on his way to Augſburgh, accompanied by Matilda counteſs of Tuſcany, a widow of great power and wealth, and much attached to his intereſts. Gregory, ſurprized to find that the king was in Italy, went to the caſtle of Canoſſa in Lombardy, which belonged to Matilda. There he was met by many biſhops and other perſons from Germany, who made their ſubmiſſion to him, and doing penance, were received into favour.

By the intervention of the counteſs, and other perſons to whom the king applied, he promiſed.

that

that if the pope would abſolve him from his excommunication, he would afterwards juſtify his conduct before him at Augſburgh. After ſome difficulty the pope conſented, but not without exacting the moſt humiliating terms, and treating him with the greateſt indignity. For the king on coming to Canoſſa left all his ſuite behind him, and without any marks of his dignity waited three days barefooted, and the firſt without eating any thing. Being admitted on the fourth day to the preſence of this haughty prelate, he was abſolved, on condition that he ſhould juſtify his conduct at the general diet of Germany, when the pope was to be his judge; till that time he ſhould wear no badge of royalty, and if he ſhould be acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge, he ſhould ever after live in obedience to the pope.

This paſſed the 28th of January A. D. 1077. After this, the pope adminiſtered the communion, and declaring his own innocence of the things of which he had been accuſed, he took a part of the conſecrated wafer, and preſenting the other part to the king, he deſired him to take it, if he alſo was conſcious of his innocence. The king, not prepared for this, heſitated; but recollecting himſelf, he ſaid that no juſtification would be of any avail to him, except in the preſence of his friends,

and his accuſers; and the pope gave him the communion in the common form.

The king's friends in Lombardy, hearing of this tranſaction, were exceedingly provoked both at him and the pope; and were determined to reject them both. In order to pacify them, after in vain pleading the neceſſity of his affairs, he within a fortnight openly broke the agreement he had made with the pope, and was ſoon able to raiſe a conſiderable army.

In the mean time the king's enemies met at Forſheim, and on the 15th of March A. D. 1077 elected Rodolf duke of Suabia king; but on his declaring himſelf an enemy to ſimony, ſuch a tumult was raiſed againſt him on the very day of his coronation, that an hundred perſons were killed in the fray. Tho' the pope's legates were preſent at this election, and concurred in it, he, no doubt conſidering the power of Henry, did not think proper to declare his approbation of it; but ſaid that, if the archbiſhops and biſhops who had conſecrated him did not give a good account of their conduct, they ſhould be depoſed from their dignities, and Rodolf from the kingdom. In another letter he ſaid that obedience ſhould be rendered to him of the two who ſhould obey the orders of his legates.

The

The friends of Rodolf, quite diſpirited at this unexpected timid conduct of the pope, wrote him an expoſtulatory letter on the ſubject. In it, they ſay, they believed his intentions to have been good, but that they could not penetrate into his views. They ſaw, however, the fatal effects of what he had done, in the civil war that muſt be the conſequence of it, in innumerable homicides, plundering, and burnings; for that, in theſe circumſtances, they could only live by rapine, and no property, civil or eccleſiaſtical, would be ſpared; in ſhort there would be an abolition of all laws, human and divine. Theſe evils, they add, would not have exiſted, if he had acted ſteadily, neither turning to the right hand nor to the left; that his zeal had drawn them into a difficulty, in which it was hazardous to advance, and ſhameful to recede.

Henry, taking advantage of the conſternation of his enemies, endeavoured to ſeize both the pope and Matilda. But they eſcaped to one of her fortreſſes in a mountain, and in this receſs ſhe made to the ſee of Rome a donation in writing of all her eſtates, comprehending Tuſcany, and a great part of Lombardy. * In May the pope returned

* This donation of Matilda was diſputed by the emperors; but the popes ſtill enjoy a part of it. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 281.

to Rome, where he was received with great joy, and at a council held there in A. D. 1078, it was determined to ſend legates to Germany, to decide between the two competitors to the throne, threatning excommunication to any perſon, king, biſhop, or others, who ſhould oppoſe this commiſſion. The pope added theſe remarkable words, "We "bind him by the apoſtolical authority, not only "as to the ſpirit, but as to the body. We take "from him all proſperity in this life, and victory "from his arms." At another council held at Rome in November, deputies from both the kings attended, each ſwearing for his maſter, that they would not hinder the conferences which the legates of the holy ſee ſhould hold in Germany. At the ſame council the receiving inveſtiture of church livings from the king, or any layman, was prohibited.

In A. D. 1080 Henry was defeated by Rodolf; and Gregory hearing of it, held a council at Rome, in which he excommunicated Henry and all his abettors; taking from him, he ſaid, the kingdom of Germany and Italy, ſo that he ſhall have no force in battle, and never gain any victory. He then gave the kingdom of Germany to Rodolf and abſolution to all his adherents, with the benediction of the apoſtles, both in this life and the other. All this was done, as before, in the form of an addreſs

addreſs to the apoſtles Peter and Paul, to whom he ſays, "Let all the world know, that if you "have power to bind and looſe in heaven, you "can now on earth give or take away empires, "kingdoms, principalities, dukedoms, marquiſates, "and counties, and the goods of all men, accord- "ing to their merits. For you have often taken "from unworthy perſons, and given to the good, "patriarchates, primacies, archbiſhopricks, and "biſhopricks. For if you judge things ſpiritual, "who can believe that you do not judge things "temporal. Let the kings and princes of the age "then learn what is your greatneſs and power, "that they may dread to deſpiſe the orders of "your church; and let your juſtice be ſo ſpeedily "exerciſed upon Henry, that all may know it "does not come by chance, but by your pow- "er." This act is dated March 7. A. D. 1080.

When Henry heard of this excommunication, nineteen biſhops of his party aſſembled at Mayence on the laſt of May, and in conſequence of their letters thirty biſhops and many lords of Italy and Germany met at Brixen in Tyrol, where they pronounced the depoſition of Gregory and elected Guibert archbiſhop of Ravenna, who took the name of Clement III, tho' there was no perſon preſent to repreſent the proper church of Rome but cardinal Hugh.

To

To ſtrengthen himſelf againſt Henry, Gregory applied to the Norman princes, William king of England, and Robert duke of Calabria; to the former of whom he wrote in a ſtyle very different from that which he uſed in the days of his proſperity; expreſſing the confidence he had in his friendſhip, and promiſing him not only an eternal recompence, but victory and power in this world. Notwithſtanding his having formerly excommunicated the Norman princes of Italy, he now had a conference with them, and received them into favour, on their promiſing him their aſſiſtance. Thus aided, Gregory ſent forth the moſt violent invectives againſt the new pope, and propoſed to march againſt him with an army.

In October A. D. 1080, Henry was again defeated by Rodolf, but the latter was ſlain in the battle; and on the ſame day the troops of Matilda were defeated in Lombardy; ſo that the affairs of Henry were rather advanced than otherwiſe. In theſe circumſtances Gregory, writing to his partiſans in Germany, exhorted them to be very cautious in their choice of another king; and in the form of the oath which he ſent them to adminiſter to him, he was to declare himſelf a vaſſal of St. Peter, and to promiſe obedience and fidelity to the pope.

In March A. D. 1081 Henry, having no more

fear

fear of the Saxons, came into Italy, and was at Verona in Eaſter, and about the ſame time Gregory held a council at Rome, in which he again excommunicated Henry, and all his adherents. This however, did not prevent Henry's marching to Rome, which he did the following May; but the people oppoſing him, and Matilda ſending aſſiſtance to Gregory, he retired to Lombardy. In the mean time the Saxons, and other enemies of Henry in Germany, made choice of Herman, lord of Luxenbourgh, to ſucceed Rodolf.

This, however, did not induce Henry to go to Germany, and in A. D. 1082 he went to Rome, which he beſieged the whole year, but was again obliged to retreat to Lombardy. The next year Herman would have come to the relief of Gregory; but the ſtate of his affairs would not admit of it, and Henry once more advanced to Rome. But finding that Hugh, the abbot of Clugny, who was then in Italy, and many other reſpectable perſons, did not approve of his conduct, but conſidered him as an excommunicated perſon, he was deſirous of juſtifying his conduct to them, and expreſſed his willingneſs to receive the imperial crown at the hands of the pope. But Gregory, tho' much urged to it by thoſe who were weary of the war, refuſed to do this, till he had given ſatisfaction to God, and the church; and this the king would not

In theſe circumſtances the pope held another council, the king giving ſafe conduct to thoſe who attended it; and on this occaſion the pope was perſuaded to uſe ſome moderation: for he did not repeat his excommunication of Henry himſelf, but was content with excommunicating thoſe who had obſtructed the communication with Rome, which Henry had frequently done. Notwithſtanding all the endeavours of the people of Rome to make peace, the war continued ſeven years, and in all the ſtates belonging to the king there remained but few biſhops faithful to the pope; being either expelled from their ſees, or having retired to monaſteries.

At length in March A. D. 1084, Henry forced his way into Rome, and there received the imperial crown from his pope Clement, Gregory retiring to the caſtle of St. Angelo, which Henry beſieged. Both parties, however, kept their ground in the city, till Robert Guiſcard compelled Henry to abandon it, and retire to Lombardy, which he did in May, but a great part of the city was plundered in this conteſt.

Gregory, being now at liberty, held another council in which he excommunicated the new pope and Henry, who now went to Germany, leaving his pope in Lombardy, where his party were defeated by the forces of Matilda, by which

it

it was considerably weakened. While Henry was in Germany councils were held both by his partisans, and those of Herman, in which they excommunicated one another.

In the mean time Gregory retried to Salerno, where he fell sick, and died the 25th of May, A. D. 1085. Being urged on his death bed to shew some indulgence to those whom he had excommunicated, he said that, excepting Henry himself, and the antipope, he absolved and blessed all those who believed that he had the power of doing it. His last words were, "I have loved righteousness, "and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile." Thus died this extraordinary man, respectable for his personal qualities, but who, misled by his passions, and carrying the false maxims concerning the papal power, which had begun to prevail before his time, to their proper extent, not only involved himself in inextricable difficulties, and a great part of the Christian world in a destructive civil war, but laid the foundation for various mischiefs, which continued many centuries. For, violent as his conduct was, and inconsistent as the maxims of it were with the temporal power of princes, they were never reprobated by any of his successors, but were resumed by them whenever the circumstances of the times were favourable to them.

In all this time Clement kept poſſeſſion of the church of St. Peter in Rome; but on the acceſſion of Victor II, who was Deſiderius, abbot of Mount Caſſin (and who did not conſent to his election till he was in a manner compelled to it) he was driven out of it. Still, however, he kept poſſeſſion of a great part of the city.

On the death of Herman in A. D. 1089, the Saxons, weary of their oppoſition, received Henry as king; and thus ended this long civil war. In the ſame year the people of Rome expelled Clement, after making him take an oath that he would no longer uſurp the holy ſee. But by this he did not appear to have thought himſelf bound, and he had a conſiderable party even in Rome two years after his expulſion, the friends of Henry being very powerful in Italy. In A. D. 1081 pope Urban II held a council at Benevento, in which he excommunicated Clement, and all his adherents.

In A. D. 1093 Conrad the ſon of Henry revolted againſt his father, and in A. D. 1094, Urban had ſo far got the better of Clement, that he held a council at Placentia, in the very midſt of the ſchiſmatics, and was met by two hundred biſhops more than four thouſand eccleſiaſtics, and thirty thouſand laymen; ſo that no church being able to contain ſo great a number, they met in the open air. In this council Proxide, the wife of Henry

Henry, made her complaints againſt him, in conſequence of which many of his adherents abandoned him. After this council Conrad met the pope at Cremona, and waited upon him; and on his ſwearing allegiance to him, and renouncing the right of inveſtiture, the pope received him as a true ſon of the church, and promiſed him his aſſiſtance to maintain him in the kingdom, and acquire the imperial dignity.

After this the pope made a progreſs into France, where he held the famous council of Clermont, of which an account will be given in the article of the Cruſades, and on his return, being aſſiſted by the Cruſaders, the friends of Clement were driven out of the city of Rome, and held only the caſtle of St. Angelo. Henry was alſo driven out of Lombardy, and was obliged to retire into Germany.

The party of Clement was not, however, extinct. For in A. D. 1098 they held a council in Rome, he himſelf being then in Lombardy; and at the head of it were eight cardinals, the principal of whom was Hugh above-mentioned biſhop of Preneſte. They invited the oppoſite party to a conference, promiſing to aim at nothing but the unity of the church. But the friends of Urban paid no attention to the propoſal, deſpiſing the efforts of a dying party; and indeed after this we hear nothing more of it.

SECTION

SECTION II.

Various Inſtances of the claims of the Popes in this Period to Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Power, and of the Oppoſition that was ſometimes made to them.

HAVING been unwilling to interrupt the account given in the preceding ſection of the general ſtate of the papacy, and eſpecially the hiſtory of Gregory VII, I have reſerved for this ſeparate ſection other leſs connected inſtances of the claims of the popes to power civil and eccleſiaſtical, and of the oppoſition that the more intelligent and more ſpirited, of the clergy or laity had the courage to make to them. I would obſerve, however, in this place, that the papal claims were favoured by the eſtabliſhed opinions and maxims of the times, without which they would never have been allowed, and acquieſced in ſo tamely as they generally were.

On the occaſion of the coronation of the emperor Henry in A. D. 1014, Glaber, in a hiſtory addreſſed to Odilon abbot of Clugny, ſays, "It "ſeems reaſonable, and well eſtabliſhed, that no "prince ſhould take the title of emperor, but he "whom the pope ſhall chuſe for his merit, and

"to

"to whom he ſhall give the badges of that dig-
"nity."

The giving of kingdoms, as well as titles, did not begin with Gregory VII. Leo IV, who was a perſon of an exemplary life, ſeeing the riſing power of the Normans in Italy, perſuaded the emperors to endeavour to put a ſtop to their progreſs, and put himſelf at the head of an army for that purpoſe, which was the firſt time that any pope headed an army againſt chriſtians, the emperor having before this granted to him his right to the city of Benevento, in exchange for an annual payment of an hundred marks of ſilver; a white horſe, which had been part of the annual allowance, being ſtill reſerved. The pope, being now at the head of an army, marched againſt the Normans; but, tho' he was defeated by them, he was treated with much reſpect. Afterwards, both parties finding it to their intereſt, the Normans conſented to ſwear fealty to the popes for their poſſeſſions in Italy, and alſo thoſe in Sicily when they ſhould conquer it. This was done to Nicolas II, in A. D. 1059. (*Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 433.) This inveſtiture was renewed by Gregory VII. *Ib.* p. 463.

Afterwards Roger count of Sicily complaining of the appointment of the biſhop of Trani as the pope's legate in Sicily, pope Urban II, finding it to be his intereſt to oblige him, appointed him

and

his heirs the power of legates of the ſee of Rome, promiſing that whatever he ſhould have to do by legates ſhould be done by himſelf and his ſucceſſors, (*Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 475) and that whenever he called a council, they might ſend what clergy they pleaſed to it. In virtue of this bull, the Sicilians ſay that their princes are born legates of the holy ſee; and this they call *the monarchy of Sicily*, no other country having that privilege. But the court of Rome ſays that, if the bull be genuine it has been revoked ſince. Clement XI when the kingdom of Naples came to the duke of Savoy in A. D. 1715, aboliſhed this monarchy of Sicily, and eſtabliſhed a new eccleſiaſtical hierarchy in that kingdom; but the bull had no effect. No change was made in conſequence of it, and much leſs when the kingdom returned to the family of Auſtria. *Giannone*, Vol. 1, p. 474.

Tho' the principle on which Gregory VII acted was avowed, and in ſome degree acted upon before his time, no other pope had recourſe to it ſo often, or carried it ſo far. Of his conduct in this reſpect I ſhall give ſeveral inſtances, which have no relation to his conteſt with the emperor Henry.

Philip king of France not being willing that Landri, choſen biſhop of Autun by the clergy and people, ſhould have the inveſtiture *gratis*, Gregory wrote to Roclon biſhop of Chalons, charging

charging him to endeavour to diſſuade the king from his purpoſe; ſaying "The king ſhall either "renounce ſimony, or being anathematiſed, the "French will refuſe to obey him, unleſs they will "renounce chriſtianity;" a threatening, which Henry ſays was never before given out againſt any ſovereign.

Great diſorders prevailing in the kingdom of France in the reign of this Philip, no merchants or pilgrims being able to travel in ſafety, Gregory wrote to the biſhops, urging them to preſs the king to exert his power to put a ſtop to the evil; ſaying that, if he proved refractory, they ſhould not only excommunicate him, and lay the kingdom under an interdict, but oppoſe him by force, as, he ſays, they were very well able to do; and in this caſe he promiſed them the aſſiſtance of the holy ſee. He alſo wrote to William count of Poictiers, to deſire him to join the biſhops on this occaſion. But the letters had no effect.

Gregory alſo threatened Alphonſus king of Leon and Caſtile, that if he did not yield to his will with reſpect to the adoption of the Roman ritual, and ſome other things, he would himſelf go into Spain, and give him much trouble, as an enemy of the chriſtian religion.

Ebles count of Rouci in Champagne treated with Alexander II for all the conqueſts that he ſhould be able to make from the Saracens in Spain.

For

For at Rome it was, ſays Fleury, taken for granted, that the kingdom of Spain belonged to St. Peter, or the church of Rome, tho' there is no trace of ſuch an idea before that time.

In A. D. 1075 Gregory wrote to Sueno king of Denmark, to know whether he might depend upon him in caſe the holy ſee ſhould want his aſſiſtance; ſaying, "There is near us a rich province occupied "by cowardly heretics, in which we deſire one of "your ſons to be eſtabliſhed as its prince, and the defender of religion."

The emperor Henry was not the only prince of that age that ſhewed a diſpoſition to reſiſt the unreaſonable claims of Gregory. When he wrote to William the conqueror, requiring him to take an oath of fealty to him and his ſucceſſors, he abſolutely refuſed, as he ſaid it was what neither himſelf, nor any of his predeceſſors had ever done; but he granted him his claim of Peter pence. At this the pope was much offended, ſaying that he preferred honour to money. He alſo complained of this king for preventing his biſhops from going to Rome; ſaying that if he did not behave with more moderation, he would draw upon himſelf the indignation of St. Peter.

Writing to Herman biſhop of Metz in A. D. 1081, he ſays, "More power is given to every ex-"orciſt, than to a lay lord. For kings and princes who

" who do not live like chriſtians are the ſlaves of " demons. If, then, the exorciſt has received em- " pire over demons, how much more over the " ſlaves and members of demons; and if the exor- " ciſt has this power, how much more the biſhop."

This pontiff, beſides being perſuaded that temporal power ought always to be ſubject to the ſpiritual, advanced particular claims to all the kingdoms of Europe, and even to Ruſſia. He wrote to the judges of Sardinia, that ſeveral princes had aſked their country of him, promiſing half the revenues of it; but that he had refuſed till he could learn what they would do. " But" ſays he, " ſince " you are devoted to St. Peter, if you perſevere as " you ought, we ſhall allow no perſon to have " your country; and if any perſon attempt the " conqueſt of it, we will obſtruct his deſigns by " methods ſpiritual and temporal." He alſo aſſumed a right to decide all differences among chriſtian princes, and threatened, in the caſe of a diſpute between two ſons of count Raimond Berenger, that if they diſobeyed him, and continued their differences, he would take the grace of St. Peter from him who ſhould be in fault; ſo that he ſhould no more gain any victory in war, or proſperity in this world.

But perhaps, the moſt extraordinary of all the wild pretenſions of this pope was his maintaining

that all popes canonically elected became ſaints of courſe. Fleury, however, expreſſes his wonder that the ſcandalous lives of the popes in the tenth century had not convinced him of his error.

More inſtances occur in this period of oppoſition to the uſurpation of the popes in ſpirituals by the biſhops, than in temporals by the princes; the biſhops having the advantage of a knowledge of the antient canons, and theſe were univerſally conſidered as of equal authority with the ſcriptures. Had it not been for the forged decretals, it would not have been in the power of the popes to exceed the bounds of other patriarchs.

John XVII having ſent a legate to dedicate a church at Loches in the dioceſe of Tours in France, a tempeſt which came on at the time was ſaid to be a judgment of God for the violation of the canons, the pope himſelf having no power to do any thing in the dioceſe of another biſhop. This was ſaid by Glaber, an hiſtorian of the time, tho' he was a monk of Clugny, which owned no ſuperior beſides its own abbot and the pope. The proper dioceſe of Rome, Fleury ſays, did not extend beyond the bounds of the city, as appeared by Leo IX in A. D. 1049, confirming to the biſhop of Porto the right of performing clerical functions beyond the Tiber.

At

At the council of Selingſtadt in A. D. 1022, it was declared that the abſolution of the pope without that of the biſhop of the dioceſe where the pilgrim lived, would ſignify nothing. Many perſons charged with great crimes, having refuſed to confeſs at home, had gone to Rome, to get abſolved there.

At the council of Limoges in A. D. 1031, a ſimilar complaint was made, viz. of excommunicated perſons getting abſolution of the pope unknown to their own biſhops, which it was ſaid would be the ruin of churches, and ſet aſide the decrees of councils; when one who attended the council ſaid that, when Ponticus count of Auvergne had been excommunicated ſome time before by Stephen biſhop of Clermont, and had got abſolved at Rome, the pope being informed of it declared that he did not know that he was in a ſtate of excommunication. "I declare" ſaid he, "to all "my brethren, the biſhops, that far from contra- "dicting, I only pretend to aid and comfort them. "God forbid that I ſhould make a ſchiſm with "them," and he annulled the abſolution.

At the council of Anſe in A. D. 1025, Gauſlin biſhop of Macon complained of Bouchard archbiſhop of Vienna, that, without his permiſſion, he had ordained monks within his dioceſe, viz. at the monaſtery of Clugny. And tho' the expreſs per-

permiſſion of the pope was pleaded for the privilege of the abbot of Clugny employing what biſhop he pleaſed, it was ſaid that the canons, which ordered it to be done by the biſhop of the dioceſe, was ſuperior to any other authority; and the archbiſhop being convinced aſked pardon. This example, ſays Fleury, and that of the dedication of the monaſtery at Loches, ſhews that the biſhops of this age did not think the popes above the canons.

The pope's legate, the archbiſhop of Laon, inſiſting on the archbiſhop of Sens ſwearing allegiance to him as his primate, the clergy refuſed to obey, and Ivo of Chartres wrote to expoſtulate with him on the ſubject; ſaying that they could not act contrary to the authority of the Fathers, and the eſtabliſhed cuſtoms; and he cited the authority of ſeveral popes, who declared that they would make no innovation againſt tradition, and the authority of the canons. He alſo wrote to the pope himſelf on the ſubject.

The canonization of ſaints began to be appropriated to the popes in this period; and the firſt inſtance of it was that of Udalric twenty years after his death, by John XV, in A. D. 993. The act expreſſed, that the memory of ſaints ſhould be honoured, that the honour done to the ſaints, and to their relics, returns to the Lord, who ſaid, *he that*

that receiveth you receiveth me; and that the object of this honour was that men might be aided by their prayers and merits. When saints were canonized at this time, altars were erected over their bodies. This was done to Romuald five years after his death in A. D. 1027.

The dispensing with vows was universally allowed to the popes of this time. When Casimer, a monk of Clugny, became heir to the kingdom of Poland, pope Benedict IX gave him leave to secularize. He had been referred to the pope by Odilon the abbot, who said that he had not the power to dispense with his vows.

Before I conclude this article relaing to the popes, I shall observe, that at a council in Rome in A. D. 1059, it was decreed that for the future the cardinal bishops should first consider of a proper person to be pope, then the cardinal clergy, and that then the rest of the clergy, and the people should give their consent. This rule was made in consequence of there having been much confusion in the election of Nicolas II. This law was not, however, immediately acquiesced in; and to quiet the clamours of the principal of the clergy, some of them were afterwards admitted to the rank of cardinal presbyters, and to pacify the inferior clergy some of them were made cardinal deacons.

The cardinal biſhops were thoſe of the territory of Rome. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2, p. 262.

Here I would obſerve that the dignity of *Cardinal* was much advanced in this period; and eſpecially as they were not only the electors of the popes, but the popes were generally choſen out of their body. It was not, however, till A. D. 1458 that Paul II gave them the diſtinction of a red hat, and it was Urban VIII who gave them the title of *eminence*. Still, however, there remain traces of their former condition. For tho' the pope calls all biſhops his *brethren*, he calls the cardinals his *beloved children*. *Sueur*, A. D. 964. *Pictet*, A. D. 1059.

By much addreſs the popes got rid of their confirmation by the emperors. When Leo IX, at the requeſt of the people, was made pope by the emperor Henry III, he was perſuaded by Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII, to ſtrip himſelf of his pontifical robes, and entering Rome as a pilgrim, get himſelf elected by the people and clergy, in order to ſet aſide the election by a layman. By the management of the ſame Hildebrand, Alexander II was elected pope without the conſent of the emperor Henry IV, who in vain oppoſed the election by ſetting up another pope. *Giannone*, Vol. p. 452. In former times, not only was the election of the popes confirmed by the emperors,

but

but they received for it twenty pounds of gold for their confirmation. *Sueur*, A. D. 964.

Mention was made in a preceding period of a pope who was a foreigner changing his name. The firſt pope who was a native of Rome that did this, was Bocco di Porco, in engliſh *hog's ſnout*, who called himſelf Sergius IV in A. D. 1009.

SECTION III.

Of the Character of the Clergy in this Period.

COMPLAINTS of the diſorderly lives of the clergy were as frequent in this period as in any of the former; the ſuperior clergy being as diſſolute as the laity of the ſame fortunes, and lived in the ſame manner.

Ratherius biſhop of Verona in A. D. 974 makes loud complaint of the licentiouſneſs of the clergy in his time. "When" ſays he "I was tranſlated "to Liege, one biſhop objected to me the canon "againſt tranſlations, when he himſelf was addict-"ed to wine and gaming, had hounds and hawks, "and did not keep his reſidence. I have heard "two of them reproach one another, that the one

"carried arms, and the other kept a concubine, "that one had committed adultery before his or- "dination, and the other had married after ordi- "nation. Can we wonder," he adds, "after this "that laymen are not ſtruck with the menaces "which we draw from the ſcriptures and the ca- "nons, when they ſee that we laugh as we are read- "ing them, and ourſelves perſiſt in deſpiſing them. "This is the reaſon why they make ſo little ac- "count of our excommunications and abſolutions, "becauſe they ſee that we ourſelves ſtand excom- "municated by the canons." There was not one of his clergy at Verona but, he ſays, kept a concubine, either publicly or privately.

Indeed the clergy of Lombardy ſeem to have been the moſt diſorderly of any in this reſpect. At a council held at Pavia in A. D. 1020, Benedict VIII complained of the licentious lives of the clergy, that they diſſipated the wealth of their churches in the open maintenance of their concubines and the children they had by them. To put a ſtop to this practice in ſome meaſure, it was decreed that the children of clergymen, even by free women, ſhould rank with ſerfs. The emperor Henry confirmed this regulation. At a council in Rome in A. D. 1050, it was ordered that thoſe women who proſtituted themſelves to prieſts ſhould be ſlaves to the palace of the Lateran. At another council

in

in the ſame city, in A. D. 1059, it was decreed that a clergyman who had kept a concubine ſhould not perform maſs, or receive his ſhare of the revenues of the church, and that thoſe who kept their continence ſhould eat and ſleep together, near to the church in which they were ordained, and have in common what they received from the church. This, Fleury, ſays, was the origin of the *regular canons*.

In A. D. 1067 Alexander II ſent legates to Milan, which was a ſcene of the greateſt diſorder, the clergy keeping women in the moſt public manner, and the children they had by them; and where all benefices were openly ſold, with conſtitutions expreſsly provided for that dioceſe. They conclude with obſerving that becauſe many perſons paid more regard to temporal puniſhments than to thoſe that are eternal, they who did not obſerve the conſtitutions ſhould pay fines according to their ranks (which are particularly ſpecified) and that till the fines were paid, they were to be in a ſtate of interdict.

So common was concubinage with the clergy of Germany, that when two councils were held in A. D. 1074 by the legates of Gregory VII for the purpoſe of repreſſing it, they abſolutely refuſed to comply. This vice, and ſimony, being almoſt univerſal in this country, this pope wrote in the

moſt earneſt manner to ſeveral of the biſhops on the ſubject; urging them to uſe every means in their power, even that of force, to compel their clergy to conform to the antient canons. At a council at Mayence in A. D. 1075, he ſent a legate with orders to oblige all the clergy of that province to diſmiſs their wives, or relinquiſh the ſervice of the altar; but when the archbiſhop of the place would have executed the order, all the clergy who were preſent expreſſed ſo much indignation, that he was in danger of his life, and the ſcheme was obliged to be given up.

In England ſome of the prieſts had two wives, or even more, and this abuſe it is ſaid was common. A council called by king Ethelred at Engham made thirty two canons for the reformation of the morals of the clergy. They were ordered to diſmiſs their wives, and they who kept their continence were promiſed to be treated as the nobles. Unfortunately the marriage of prieſts was conſidered in the ſame light as concubinage.

Simony was another great complaint of this period, and ſo common that few perſons thought it to be any ſin. As ordination by a ſimoniac was deemed to be invalid, much difficulty was neceſſarily occaſioned by the commonneſs of this vice, and the councils were obliged to remit of the ſtrict-

neſs

neſs of diſcipline in this reſpect. At a council in Rome in A. D. 1047, it was agreed that a perſon who knew that he had been ordained by a ſimoniac ſhould continue his functions after forty days penance; and at another council in the ſame city in A. D. 1059, they were allowed to continue their functions, as an indulgence on account of the ſtate of the times, but that for the future if any one was ordained by one whom he knew to be a ſimoniac they ſhould both be depoſed.

When church livings were bought, the clergy would naturally endeavour to make the moſt of them, and get all the money they could in other ways; and as the intereſt of the more eminent of the clergy in councils was conſiderable, this alſo was an article which had its price. Damiani ſays, that he knew one of his brethren who rejoiced at the approach of a council, as of a harveſt or vintage, and had emiſſaries to draw to him money from all quarters on ſuch occaſions.

Ratherius biſhop of Verona in A. D. 974, complains that the prieſts and deacons divided among them all the revenues of the church, while the ſubdeacons, acolyths, and the reſt of the inferior clergy had not enough to live on. By this means, ſays Fleury, the functions of the inferior clergy came to be diſcontinued.

I ſhall

I ſhall conclude this general account of the ſimony with which the clergy of this period are charged, with a particular account of an inſtance of it, as this will give us a clearer idea of the ſpirit and manners of theſe wretched times.

At the council of Thouloufe in A. D. 1059, the viſcount of Narbonne complained that Geofrey had been made biſhop of that city at the age of ten years for a hundred thouſand ſous; promiſing to be a friend to his family, of which it was purchaſed, and that the ſee ſhould not be a ſufferer; but that when he came of age, inſtead of being in friendſhip with him, he had made a cruel war upon him, in which almoſt a thouſand perſons had been killed on both ſides; that he had ſeized the caſtles and lands of the church, and given them to his friends; that he had ſeized the biſhoprick of Urgel and given it to his brother for a hundred thouſand ſous; that to raiſe this ſum the latter had ſold the treaſure of his church, and the valuable utenſils belonging to it; and to ſecure himſelf, had put himſelf under the protection of the counteſs of Urgel. He further accuſed him of violating the truce of God after having ſworn to obſerve it; that tho' he had propoſed to refer their differences to the pope, he had paid no regard to the propoſal, but had excommunicated himſelf and his wife and children, and laid all his

his eſtates under an interdict. "If" ſays he, "it "was not for the fear of God, I would make no "account of the excommunication of a man load-"ed with ſo many crimes, and anathematized by pope Victor" (ſuppoſed to have been at the coun-cil of Florence in the year before) "We know" he added, "that he has ſold all the holy orders that "he has conferred. He refuſed to conſecrate the "churches in my eſtates unleſs he received the ſa-"laries of them. Wherefore I make my com-"plaint to God and you, and demand juſtice. If "I do not obtain it I ſhall pay no regard to his "excommunication, and ſhall not keep the truce "in my eſtates." He then renewed his propoſal to go to Rome; ſaying the biſhop would not go except in bonds. What was done in conſequence of this does not appear.

The hiſtory of Peter biſhop of Florence A. D. 1063 is ſtill more extraordinary. He was made biſhop by his father, who was a nobleman of Pavia, purchaſing that dignity for him. In conſequence of this, the monks, with John Gualbert, founder of the celebrated monaſtery of Valambroſa near Florence at their head, ſupported by one Theuſon a recluſe, refuſed to communicate with him, conſidering him as a ſimoniac, and conſequently a heretic. However, Damiani, tho' a great reformer, oppoſed them in this, becauſe he had

had not been judicially condemned. The monks, not at all conciliated by the advice of Damiani, continued their oppoſition; and by the advice of Theuſon, Gualbert made proclamation in the public ſquare of the city, that the biſhop was a ſimoniac, and by this means excited the people in general againſt him.

The biſhop, ſeeing a great part of the clergy and the body of the people, animated againſt him, ſent a number of armed men in the night to deſtroy the monaſtery of St. Salvi, which was near the city, and under the conduct of Gualbert. Him they did not find, but they fell ſword in hand on the monks they found there, wounding ſome of them very dangerouſly, and ſtripping the reſt. They then overturned the altar, plundered every thing they met with, and ſet fire to the lodges. The people, inflamed with this violent proceeding, took the part of the monks, and with Gualbert brought an accuſation againſt the biſhop at a council held at Rome A. D. 1063, under Alexander II, attended by more than a hundred biſhops, offering to prove the charge of ſimony by the ordeal of fire. But the majority of the biſhops favouring their brother, the pope would not depoſe him, or even allow of the trial by fire; tho' Hildebrand, then archdeacon, and afterwards pope Gregory VII, took the part of the monks.

The

The biſhop, being acquitted at Rome, perſecuted the monks with great violence, and alſo thoſe of the clergy who refuſed to communicate with him; ſo that the archprieſt and many others took refuge in the monaſtery of Septima, where Gualbert received them. But the party of the biſhop was ſupported by Godfrey duke of Tuſcany, who threatened his oppoſers with death.

The pope hoping to allay this diſturbance went himſelf to Florence, but returned without any ſucceſs. He found the monks clamorous for the trial by fire, and ſaw the wood they had prepared for the purpoſe; but he would not ſee the experiment. After this the clergy and the people in general, perſiſting in their purpoſe, aſſembled, and complained violently of the biſhop, urging him to ſee the proof of his guilt by the fire. But, like the pope, he would not conſent to this, and impriſoned or baniſhed thoſe who would not ſubmit to him.

This meaſure increaſed the ferment, and preparation having been made for their favourite mode of trial by fire at the monaſtery of Septima, by making two piles of wood, ten feet long, five feet broad, and four feet high, ſeparated by a ſpace of ſix feet, which was alſo covered with hot embers; on the day fixed for it, a vaſt croud of people, with many women and children, not leſs than three thouſand, went

went to the place, which was ſeven miles from the city. All things being ready, after much ſolemn religious ceremony, and the recital of a prayer ſuited to the occaſion, a monk of the name of Peter dreſſed in a clerical habit, which was looſe and flowing, and holding a crucifix in his hand, very deliberately walked through a quantity of hot embers, up, it was ſaid, to his ancles, without receiving the leaſt hurt Neither his garments, which were of linen, nor the hairs of his legs were ſo much as ſinged.

An account of this tranſaction was immediately ſent to the pope by the clergy and people, deſiring him to deliver them from their biſhop, thus clearly proved to be a ſimoniac, and he thought proper to depoſe him. He not only ſubmitted to the ſentence, but became a monk in the monaſtery of Septima. The monk Peter, who went through the fire, was of the family of the Aldebrandini, and was made abbot of Ficicle. He was afterwards made a cardinal and biſhop of Albania, and always went by the name of *Peter Igneus*. By what means he went through the fire without receiving any hurt, it is impoſſible at this diſtance of time to diſcover. It is evident that the whole was under the management of the monks, and they made it anſwer their purpoſe. Some farther ob-

ſervations

ſervations on this ſuppoſed miracle will be found in the miſcallaneous ſection of this period.

In both the inſtances we ſee with what readineſs the clergy had recourſe to arms; but the moſt violent thing of this kind that occurs in the courſe of this period was a fray that happened in the cathedral of Goſlar in A. D. 1063, then the reſidence of the court, Henry IV, then very young, being preſent. The two parties were thoſe of Hecilon biſhop of Hildeſheim, and Viclerad abbot of Fulda, and the occaſion of it was nothing more than a diſpute about placing the ſeats at veſpres. Slight, however, as was the original cauſe, theſe great prelates intereſting themſelves in it, provided men with arms, determined each of them to carry their reſpective points; and not only did they fight in the church, but many were killed on the altar itſelf; the biſhop from an elevated ſituation encouraging his men to fight without regard to the place, or the preſence of the young king, who was with great difficulty got out. The biſhop's men had the advantage, and drove the others out of the church. The citizens, however, took the part of the abbot, and were prepared to attack the biſhop's men, when they came out, but night put an end to the combat, and favoured their eſcape. The abbot was moſt blamed as he came attended with ſo many armed men,

and it is thought that he would have been deprived of his abbey, but that he ſaved himſelf by money.

We ſhall the leſs wonder at the biſhops and abbots of this period having recourſe to arms, when it is conſidered that their great eſtates enabled them to live in the ſtyle of princes, and to make uſe either of the ſpiritual or the temporal ſword as they ſaw occaſion. Adalberon II biſhop of Metz about A. D. 995 proſecuted with vigour thoſe who plundered the poſſeſſions of the church, or of the poor; and when they deſpiſed his eccleſiaſtical cenſures, he employed, as the hiſtorian ſays, the arm of fleſh, ravaging the lands, and demoliſhing the caſtles, of his oppoſers. *

Robert archbiſhop of Rheims lived altogether like a prince, occupied with his temporal affairs and his pleaſures. He even married a wife, with whom he lived in public, and had three children. He is much praiſed for his liberality, eſpecially with reſpect to churches. He rebuilt his own cathedral from the foundation. He was archbiſhop forty-eight years, and died A. D. 1037. Towards the

* The empire being full of diſorder in the reign of Henry IV, Annon archbiſhop of Cologne was deſired by the king and the nobles to take upon him the government of the ſtate, and he ſoon put a ſtop to the violences.

the close of his life, he did penance for his uncanonical mode of living.

Otho the Great was particularly distinguished for his liberality to the church, influenced, it is said, by the superstition of his wife Adelaid. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 188. But it was not till the reign of Otho III that the principal bishops of Germany made great advances in their style and mode of living, in which they imitated, and equalled, the great lay lords. Like them they had professed cooks, magnificent hotels, and buffoons, and obtained of the emperor leave to hunt all kinds of wild beasts. *Sueur.*

When bishops resembled secular princes so much in their manner of life, it is not extraordinary that many of them should have been illiterate. The canons of the church of Bamberg having been expelled by the bishop who put monks in their place, and was excommunicated for that and other offences by the pope in A. D. 1075, one of the canons produced a verse in one of the psalms; and said that if he could explain it, not in any mystical or allegorical sense, but word for word, he would acknowledge him to be innocent, and worthy of the bishoprick; but it did not appear that he could do it. Stigand archbishop of Canterbury A. D. 1058 who on this promotion did not quit the bishoprick of Winchester, and several

abbeys which he held, was illiterate; as it is ſaid almoſt all the biſhops of England at that time were. He thought of nothing but ſatisfying his ambition and avarice, trafficking in the moſt public manner for biſhopricks and abbeys. He was archbiſhop of Canterbury ſeventeen years.

Pluralities were very common in this period. The famous Dunſtan was biſhop of Wincheſter and London at the ſame time. As an excuſe for it, it was alleged that St. John was biſhop of Epheſus and of ſeven other churches.

We are not, however, to conclude that all the biſhops of this period were equally licentious and illiterate. There were many great exceptions of biſhops equally eminent for virtue and literature, eſpecially in Germany in the reign of Henry II, who promoted many excellent men, as Meingaud and Poppon of Treves, Herebert and Pelegrim of Cologne, Villegiſe, Archambauld and Aribon of Mayence, Burchard of Worms, Ansfred and Athalbold of Utrecht, and many others enumerated by Fleury.

The civil and eccleſiaſtical power in thoſe times contributed in their turns to advance each other. At a council held in Rome in A. D. 964, pope Leo VIII, with all the clergy and the people of Rome, granted to the emperor Otho and his ſucceſſors the power of chuſing a ſucceſſor for the king.

kingdom of Italy, to confirm the pope, and to give inveſtitures to biſhops; ſo that no patrician, pope, or biſhop, could be choſen without his conſent, under pain of excommunication, perpetual exile, or death. On the other hand the temporal princes, eſpecially thoſe of Germany, ſet no bounds to their liberality to the church. Hence the great principalities they are ſtill poſſeſſed of in that country. In A. D. 999 Otho III gave the city of Verceil in Italy to every future biſhop of that city; which, Fleury ſays, is the firſt inſtance of civil power given ſo expreſsly to a church.

The power of giving implies that of withholding, and of taking away and controlling; and this both the civil and eccleſiaſtical powers availed themſelves of as circumſtances favoured them. A happy uſe was made of the eccleſiaſtical power in the caſe of the emperor Henry II. Having declared his reſolution to be a monk to Richard abbot of St. Vanes of Verdun, and taken the oath of obedience, the abbot ſaid, "I command you to "return, and take upon you the government of "the empire that God has put into your hands, "and that by your firmneſs in doing juſtice you "procure, as far as ſhall be in your power, the "good of the ſtate."

But the power of the clergy was ſhamefully abuſed in the buſineſs of excommunication, and

their making themſelves the judges of the laws of marriage. Of this we have two remarkable inſtances in the hiſtory of the kings of France within this period, Robert and Philip. The former of thoſe princes refuſing to divorce his wife, whom he had been ordered to diſmiſs by pope Gregory, in a council held at Rome in A. D. 998, was excommunicated by him; and the conſequence was that no perſon would have any intercourſe with him, except two domeſtics, who however, threw into the fire all the veſſels in which he ate or drank. This, at leaſt, is related by P. Damien, who wrote ſixty years after. In A. D. 1001 the king found it neceſſary to diſmiſs his queen.

In the caſe of Robert the excommunication was laid on by the pope, but in that of Philip the biſhops of the country took upon themſelves to control the king. This prince having put away his wife Bertha, and married Bertrade, who had been married four years to the count of Anjou, Ivo biſhop of Chartres remonſtrated with him on the ſubject, but the king perſiſted, and concluded the marriage; and to expreſs his reſentment againſt the biſhop he made war upon him, plundering his lands, and ſeizing his perſon. On this pope Urban wrote to the archbiſhop of Rheims and his ſuffragans, reproving them for ſuffering ſuch a crime, inſiſting on their going to the king and re-

mon-

monſtrating with him, and their threatening him with the ſpiritual ſword if he did not repent. The king ſtill perſiſting, at a council held at Autun in A. D. 1094, the clergy excommunicated him, tho', his former wife Bertha being then dead, he had hoped that the ſecond marriage would have been allowed.

Philip, being thus excommunicated by the council, ſent deputies to the pope, aſſuring him that he had no criminal commerce with Bertrade, and threatening that, if he did not take off the excommunication, and reſtore to him his crown, he would withdraw from his obedience, and go over to Guibert the antipope. On this the pope, tho' apprized that what the king ſaid was not true, thought proper to give him a reſpite till All Saints in A. D. 1095, taking off the excommunication, and permitting him to wear his crown as before. For it was then the cuſtom on great feſtivals for the king to appear in his royal apparel, and to have the crown put on his head by a biſhop. The king not being reclaimed by this indulgence, was excommunicated at the council of Clermont in A. D. 1095, but without any prejudice to his royal dignity. This brought the king to ſubmit to the church; and having made ſatisfaction, and promiſed to diſmiſs his wife, he was abſolved from

his excommunication at the council of Niſmes in the year following.

Odo archbiſhop of Canterbury proceeded in a more violent manner with king Edwy. He not only took from him his favourite concubine, but abuſed her in a ſhocking manner, and ſent her to Ireland. On her return he caught her again, and even put her to death in a miſerable manner.

The clergy derived great advantage from their arbitrary conſtructions of the degrees of affinity within which it was lawful to contract marriage. In A. D. 1065 pope Alexander II held a council at Rome to ſettle this buſineſs, in conſequence of a diſpute on the ſubject in which P. Damiani had taken a conſiderable part; and it was ſettled, that the canon law for regulating marriage was eſſentially different from the civil law, which regulated the ſucceſſion to eſtates. For whereas two brothers according to the civil law are in the firſt degree of relationſhip, according to the canon law they are in the ſecond; and couſins german, who are in the ſecond according to the civil law, are in the fourth according to the canon law; the one beginning with the common anceſtor, and the other aſcending to him, and then deſcending again.

The degrees of relationſhip, as was obſerved before, were extended beyond the bounds of nature by godfathers and godmothers at baptiſm being con-

conſidered as real relations, and by this means the limits of contracting marriage were much abridged; and this was no leſs ſo in the Eaſt than in the Weſt. The emperor Nicephorus Phocas being ſaid to have been godfather to a child of Theophania, whom he had married to his ſecond wife, the marriage was thought to be unlawful on account of this ſpiritual relationſhip, and the patriarch Polyeuctes would not receive him into communion.

The great conteſt between the civil and eccleſiaſtical powers which aroſe in this period, was about the right of *inveſtiture*, or the diſpoſal of biſhpricks, and other church preferments. When the clergy became poſſeſſed of eſtates in land, given them by princes and great lords, it was natural that they ſhould ſwear fealty to them, and even perform the ſame duties that were exacted of other holders of land, ſuch as ſerving in the wars, or furniſhing a number of men for the purpoſe. By degrees theſe ſervices were remitted to churchmen as unſuitable to their character; but, ſtill, as the lands were a gift, and the heirs of the grantor had an intereſt in the poſſeſſion of the land, the new occupant, as in civil caſes, was not admitted without his conſent. This was evidently the caſe with reſpect to the pope himſelf. But at this time both the popes and other biſhops of great power, feel-

ing their importance, began to be impatient of their dependence on the temporal princes; and as church preferments had been generally given for money, by needy princes and lords, which was called simony, and universally condemned, tho' almost universally practised, it was now thought to be wrong to suffer their interference in this business in any respect; on the principle that laymen, having no spiritual character, could not convey spiritual things; as if the appointment of a bishop had been the same thing with the giving of holy orders. The universal custom, tho' now objected to, was against this maxim. In Germany in particular, where the dispute arose, when any bishop died, the prince had been regularly informed of it, and the clergy and people always waited for his consent before they proceeded to the election of another; and he confirmed their election by the delivery of a ring and pastoral staff, as badges of their office, and then the new bishop took the oath of allegiance to the prince before he took possession of the bishopric.

As a custom universally established could not easily be broken, artful methods were at first used to evade it. After the death of Alexander II, who while he was pope retained the bishoprick of Lucca, Anselm, whom Alexander himself had recommended, was chosen in his place, and had been sent

ſent before hand to king Henry IV to obtain the inveſtiture, which ſhews that then he did not condemn the practice. But Anſelm, who thought that the ſecular power ought not to give eccleſiaſtical dignities, managed in ſuch a manner as to return, and take poſſeſſion of the biſhoprick without the ceremony of receiving inveſtiture, and in A. D. 1073 he went to Rome to be ordained. The king, however, ſent to the pope to require that he would not ordain either him, or Hugh biſhop of Die, becauſe they had not received inveſtiture. With reſpect to Anſelm, the pope complied, but not with reſpect to Hugh, who had been choſen ſuddenly by the clergy and people in the place of one who was a ſimoniac, himſelf being then a layman, the pope's legate being then at the place, and approving of the choice. As he was then on a pilgrimage to Rome, he received his holy orders there.

Anſelm was afterwards ſeized with a ſcruple, and went to Clugni, in order to become a member of that community; but being commanded by the pope, he left the monaſtery, and having given the ring and the paſtoral ſtaff which he received from the king into the hands of the pope, the latter reſtored to him his functions, allowing him to retain the monaſtic habit.

After

After this, in the progreſs of the differences between Gregory and Henry, the clergy took more courage, and openly aſſerted their independence on the civil power. At a council at Poictiers in A. D. 1078, the biſhops and other eccleſiaſtical perſons, were forbidden to receive inveſtiture from kings, or other laymen. Victor III, in a council at Beneventum, decreed that, if any perſon received a biſhoprick, or abbey, from any layman, he ſhould be conſidered as no biſhop or abbot. But Urban II, at the council in Rome in A. D. 1099, proceeded farther than this; for then an excommunication was pronounced againſt all laymen who ſhould grant inveſtitures of churches, and alſo againſt all the clergy who ſhould receive them at their hands, or conſecrate thoſe who received them, and againſt all thoſe who ſhould do homage to laymen for any eccleſiaſtical dignity. "For," ſaid the pope, "one cannot ſee without "horror hands raiſed to the ſupreme honour of "creating the creator, and offering him to his "father for the ſalvation of the world, reduced to "this infamy of ſubmitting to hands continually "ſtained with the touch of infamous things, rapine, "and the effuſion of blood." All the aſſembly cried, *Be it ſo.*

Notwithſtanding the great power of the clergy in this period, there were ſtill loud and juſt complaints

plaints of the ſeizing of their temporalities by lawleſs violence. This appears by the council of Leon in Spain in A. D. 1012, to have been as much the caſe in that country as in Germany, France, and Italy, of which Ditmar makes ſo much complaint. Abbon, the abbot of Fleury, complained that, even the advocates of the church, or thoſe who held fiefs of it, in order to defend it, were themſelves the greateſt plunderers of it. "Whence," he ſays, "we ſee ſo many churches deſtroyed, and "ſo many monaſteries in ruins; becauſe men pre"ſent themſelves as the protectors of them, and on "that pretence ſeize the greateſt part of the revenues." At the acceſſion of pope Gregory VI the temporalities of the ſee were ſo much diminiſhed, that, excepting a few cities near Rome, and the oblations of the faithful, little remained for his ſubſiſtence; all the diſtant patrimony being occupied by uſurpers. Rome itſelf was full of aſſaſſins and plunderers. They fought even at the altars, and on the tombs of the apoſtles, to carry off the oblations, and uſe them in feaſts with their proſtitutes. At Rome there was a ſingular kind of abuſe, to which Gregory VII put a ſtop. There were ſixty perſons called *Manſionaries*, habited like prieſts, at the church of St. Peter, who made the pilgrims believe that they were prieſts, received their offerings, and gave them abſolution; and

and at night, on the pretence of guarding the church, they went out, and committed all kinds of crimes.

We find a complaint similar to this in the eaſt. It had been the cuſtom in the beginning of the eleventh century to give a decayed monaſtery to a rich and powerful perſon, for the purpoſe of reſtoring it, that they might be its benefactors and protectors. But this was grown into ſuch abuſe, that they were conſidered as their abſolute property, ſo that they received and enjoyed the revenues of them. By this means women ſometimes became poſſeſſed of the monaſteries of men, and men thoſe of women; and as many ſecular perſons were received into the monaſteries as monks, ſo that the diſcipline was wholy relaxed. This abuſe was rectified by the conſtitution of Alexis in A. D. 1027.

One principal cauſe of the great diſorders and violences of theſe times, by which the clergy, as the moſt defenceleſs part of the community, ſuffered the moſt, was the independence of the feudal lords, and the weakneſs of the kings. For near two hundred years from the reign of Louis le Debonnaire the ſovereign authority was little reſpected in France, Germany or Italy. Every lord thought he had a right to do himſelf juſtice by force of arms; and as cauſes of complaint were infinitely multiplied, there

there was nothing but violence, and it was not conſidered as any crime. They who were the moſt expoſed were the merchants, artizans and labourers, and the reſt of the common people, but eſpecially the monks and the clergy, who were forbidden the uſe of arms.

Great evils, however, require, and always find, ſome remedy; becauſe it comes to be the general intereſt that ſome ſhould be applied, and in this caſe we find recourſe had to various expedients. At a a council of Poictiers in A. D. 1004, the lords promiſed, and gave hoſtages to obſerve one of its orders, which was that whoever injured a church, plundered the poor, or ſtruck a diſarmed clergyman, ſhould be anathematized; and that for all uſurpations that had been made in the preceding five years, or ſhould be made for the future, they ſhould demand juſtice of the prince, or particular lord, who ſhould cauſe juſtice to be done; that if he was unable to procure juſtice, he ſhould aſſemble the lords and biſhops who aſſiſted at that council, and they ſhould march againſt him as againſt a rebel, and lay waſte his eſtates, till he ſubmitted to reaſon.

At the council of Limoges in A. D. 1031, Odalric abbot of St. Martial, in order to procure peace among the lords, who were continually at war with one another, propoſed to lay the whole country

try under an interdict till the lords ſhould conſent to it. To alarm them the more, the biſhop of Caſtres ſaid that a certain knight who had been excommunicated, and refuſed to be abſolved, had been buried by his relations without any funeral rites in the church, but that the next morning the body was found thrown out of the grave; that the ſame thing took place repeatedly, after five attempts to bury him, and that at length they buried him out of the church yard. This ſtory anſwered the purpoſe in that ſuperſtitious age. The lords were terrified, and ſwore peace among themſelves.

In the time of king Robert they began to apply more effectual remedies to this great evil. At a council held at Elne in Rouſſillon in A. D. 1027, it was ordered that no perſon ſhould attack his enemy from three o'clock in the afternoon on ſaturday till day break on monday; that no perſon ſhould attack a monk or clergyman travelling without arms, or any perſon going to church or, returning from it, or travelling in company with women; and that no perſon ſhould attack a church, or a houſe within thirty paces of it, under pain of excommunication.

After a dreadful famine of three years continuance, about A. D. 1030, ſeveral councils were held in which theſe abuſes were reformed. The principal object was to procure peace, ſo that all perſons

perſons might travel without arms, whatever differences they might have; that churches ſhould be ſanctuaries for all crimes, but that of breaking this peace.

At length, in A. D. 1041, the lords not being able to make a ſettled peace, agreed to a truce called the *truce of God*, which was that from wedneſday evening to monday morning no perſon ſhould take any thing by force. It came to be called the truce of God, becauſe it was thought that ſeveral perſons who had violated it were puniſhed in a miraculous manner.

This truce of God was confirmed and extended to other ſeaſons at the council of Narbonne in A. D. 1054, under the penalty of anathema and perpetual baniſhment. At the ſame time it was forbidden to cut down olive trees, becauſe they furniſhed matter for the chriſm, and the lighting of churches. Alſo ſhepherds and their flocks were not to be moleſted, churches and their revenues were to be held ſacred, all clergymen and monks without arms, and merchants and pilgrims. The truce of God was decreed in Normandy under William the conqueror in A. D. 1080, and farther confirmed at a council in Rouen in A. D. 1096, when all perſons above the age of twelve years were obliged to ſwear to it.

Thus, by the efforts of the biſhops, the public tranquility was in ſome meaſure reſtored. Before this biſhops, and even popes, were obliged to have recourſe to arms. Gregory VI, finding excommunications uſeleſs, applied this remedy, and by this means made travelling in ſome meaſure ſafe. But the Romans having been long accuſtomed to plunder, ſaid the pope was a blood thirſty man, unworthy of offering ſacrifices to God. The cardinals themſelves uſed the ſame language.

When thoſe times of violence began to abate, there was a great emulation in France in rebuilding churches, and monaſteries. At this time the cathedral of St. Martin at Tours was built in a magnificent manner by Hervé the treaſurer.

SECTION IV.

Of the Monks in this Period.

TWO very conſiderable new orders of monks had their riſe in this period; the Carthuſians, and the Ciſtercians, tho' both of them on the general principles of the Benedictines.

Bruno, the founder of the former of theſe orders, was a canon of the church of Rheims, and a difference which he had with Manaſſes the archbiſhop,

biſhop, whoſe irregularities gave him great offence, was the cauſe of his retreat. Diſcourſing with Roul le Vert, the provoſt of that church, and another perſon of the name of Fulcius, of the vanity of the riches and pleaſures of this world, and of the joys of eternity, they all made a vow to quit the world as ſoon as poſſible, and take the monaſtic habit; but the execution being deferred till the return of Fulcius from a journey which he made to Rome, where he ſtayed a long time, the zeal of Roul grew cool, and he continued at Rheims of which he was afterwards archbiſhop, but Bruno kept firm to his purpoſe.

Without waiting for the return of Fulcius, he went to conſult Hugh biſhop of Grenoble, who had quitted his biſhoprick, and retired to the monaſtery of Chaiſe Dieu, where he paſſed a year, but by order of the pope had reſumed the duties of his office. It was three years after this that Bruno with ſix companions viſited him. He received them with great kindneſs, approved of their reſolution, and adviſed them to fix themſelves at *Carthuſium*, a ſolitary place, ſurrounded with frightful mountains of difficult acceſs near Grenoble.

In this place they made an eſtabliſhment in A. D. 1084, and by their charter the biſhop forbad any women to paſs thro' the lands belonging to the

brothers; nor was any perſon allowed to fiſh, to hunt, or lead any cattle to paſture there. They had a church, and each brother had a ſmall cell round the incloſure of the monaſtery, where they worked, ate, and ſlept. On ſundays they received from the ſteward their proviſion for the week, which conſiſted of bread and pulſe, which each of them cooked for himſelf, drinking only water. They received neither ſilver nor gold, nor any ornaments for their church. They heard maſs at certain hours, they ſeldom ever ſpake, they wore hair cloth next their ſkin, and their clothing was very mean. They lived under the direction of a prior, the biſhop of Grenoble, ſerving for an abbot. This is the account that Guibert gives of their manners when theſe monks were only thirteen in number, tho' more than twenty laymen lived under their conduct at the foot of their mountain. Rigorous as this inſtitution was, it was adopted in all parts of Europe, and the rules of it were reduced to a more regular ſyſtem. What they are ſtill chiefly diſtinguiſhed by is their ſilence, and not eating at a common table.

According to the inſtitute of the Carthuſians, publiſhed by the prior Guignes, about forty-five years after the foundation, the prior was to be a prieſt, who had a ſteward for the management of temporal affairs, and alſo for the conduct of the lay

lay brothers; who, being illiterate, needed inſtruction. All the proper monks had parchment provided for them, as the tranſcribing of books was their common occupation.

With reſpect to ſtrangers, they received perſons, but not their horſes, as they could not afford the expence of it; they gave alms to the poor, but did not lodge them, leſt it ſhould interrupt their ſolitude, and they never ſent any perſon to beg. Novices were not received to profeſſion under twenty years of age. They never went out of their cells except to church. If they had occaſion to ſpeak, it was in few words, and not by ſigns, as at Clugni.

From the middle of September to Eaſter they ate only once a day, the reſt of the year twice on ſundays, thurſdays, and ſaturdays. They drank no pure wine, and ate no white bread. They had fiſh only for the ſick, and ſeldom had recourſe to medicine; but they were let blood five times in the year. They were ſhaved only ſix times. They had neither gold nor ſilver in their churches, except a chalice for the euchariſt. They had no poſſeſſions beyond the bounds of their deſert. They buried only their brethren, and had no anniverſary feſtival. They did not approve of the cuſtom of ſaying maſſes for other perſons, which made prayers venal, or having magnificent feaſts, leſt it

ſhould hurt their abſtinence. Their lay brothers were not obliged to ſuch rigorous abſtinence, or ſilence. The number of monks was fixed at thirteen, and that of the lay brothers at ſixteen.

After Bruno had governed at Carthuſium ſix years, he was ſent for to Rome by pope Urban, who had been his diſciple at Rheims, to aſſiſt him with his advice, leaving his charge of the monaſtery to Seguin the abbot of Chaiſe Dieu, to whom the place originally belonged. His monks followed him to Italy, but he perſuaded them to return, and gave them Landuin for a prior, and he governed them ten years. Bruno himſelf, unable to bear the tumult of Rome, retired with Landuin, and ſome others, to the dioceſe of Squillace in Calabria, where count Roger gave them a foreſt of a league in extent. There he lived eleven years, and there he died.

The founder of the Ciſtercians was Robert, abbot of Moleſme. He and ſeveral of his monks, reflecting that the rules of Benedict, to which they had ſworn, were by no means conformed to in that monaſtery, and not being able to prevail upon the reſt to ſubmit to them, with the leave of pope Urban, they left the place, and fixed themſelves at *Ciſtercium*, (in French *Citeaux*) five miles from Dijon in the dioceſe of Chalons. It was then a deſert place, covered with wood and briars, which

which they began to clear, and where they lodged themſelves in wooden cells, with the conſent of Gautier the biſhop of the dioceſe, and Renaud Vicount of Beaune, to whom the land belonged. Here they eſtabliſhed themſelves the firſt of March A. D. 1098.

The archbiſhop of Lyons, ſeeing their extreme poverty, wrote to Eudes duke of Burgundy to recommend them to him; and he at his own expence finiſhed the wooden buildings they had begun, and for a long time ſupplied them with all neceſſaries; and the biſhop of Chalons gave Robert the paſtoral ſtaff in quality of abbot. By application to the pope Robert was afterwards induced to return to the monaſtery of Moleſme; but they who remained at Citeaux choſe another abbot, Alberic, who had been prior of Moleſme, and was then prior of Citeaux.

There were three other great reformers of monaſtic diſcipline in France within this period, Richard abbot of Verdun, in the beginning of the eleventh century, Odilon abbot of Clugny, and William of Dijon.

Conſidering the varieties there are in men's diſpoſitions and ſituations, we cannot wonder at the variety of forms in which men devoted themſelves to what they conſidered as *religion*, in oppoſition

to the licentious manners of thoſe times. I ſhall mention two which took place in this period.

In A. D. 1091 many laymen in Germany renounced the world, giving themſelves and their property to the ſervice of particular communities, regular clergy, or monks, to live under their conduct. This being blamed by many, pope Urban wrote in approbation of it, as an image of the primitive church. There were alſo many young women who, renouncing marriage, put themſelves under the conduct of ſome prieſt, or of a married woman, living in obedience, and great piety. Whole villages adopted this mode of devotion and endeavoured to ſurpaſs one another in ſanctity.

In the eleventh century we find the inſtitution of *lay brothers*. Theſe were illiterate perſons, who therefore could not be clergy, and devoted themſelves wholly to labour. The firſt monaſtery that had theſe lay brothers was that of Valambroſe. After this was that of Herſuage, and the abbot William is ſaid to be the firſt inſtitutor of this claſs of religious. The Carthuſians alſo had them, and called them *bearded brothers*. They made ſolemn vows, and were real monks. For ſome time before this reading had been almoſt confined to the clergy, and almoſt all the monks were become ſo, whereas originally they were all laymen.

There

There were alſo in all monaſteries a ſecond claſs of perſons called *donati*, or *oblati*, who, without making the profeſſion, or wearing a habit different from that of other perſons, gave themſelves and their property to the monaſteries, obeying the ſuperior, and living in celibacy, in which reſpect they differed from *ſerfs*, who were married. For there were alſo *ſerfs of devotion*, or freemen who devoted themſelves to the ſervice of particular monaſteries; and, as a mark of it, put the cord of the church bell about their necks, laid their head upon the altar, or put pieces of money on their heads.

In this period too the order *canons regular* was made more perfect, all private property being excluded; ſo that they were nearly in the ſame ſituation with monks. This regulation was made at a council held in Rome in A. D. 1063, under Alexander II.

Every thing that was thought to look like religion being in this age confined to monaſteries, there was a great reſort to them on a variety of occaſions. Pope Alexander II having promiſed an indulgence for ſins that were confeſſed, to thoſe who ſhould aſſiſt at the dedication of the monaſtery of Mount Caſſin, when it was repaired in A. D. 1071, it drew together a prodigious number of perſons. Not only the monaſtery itſelf, and the town, but the neighbouring fields were filled. Such, how-

ever, were the revenues of the place, and the liberality of the abbot, that they were all ſupplied by him with bread and wine and fiſh, three days before the dedication, and as many after it. This ſolemn dedication ſo much increaſed the reputation of the monaſtery, and of the abbot Deſiderius, that all princes ſent preſents to it, and in two years the monks increaſed to the number of nearly two hundred.

Monaſteries were far, however, from being free from abuſe in this age. Ulric, in his account of the cuſtoms of Clugny, written in A. D. 1091, ſays, that one chief cauſe of it was parents who had many children relieving themſelves of thoſe who were lame, maimed, or who had any other bodily defect, by putting them into monaſteries. Houſes filled with thoſe invalids, he ſays, could not obſerve any regularity; and that the obſervance of the rules was exact only in thoſe monaſteries in which the greater number of monks conſiſted of perſons who entered them at mature age, and of their own free choice.

In this period, as well as in the former, we find examples of perſons in the higher ranks devoting themſelves to the monaſtic life. Cunegund, the wife of the emperor Henry II, took the vows in a peculiarly ſolemn manner after the death of her huſband, in a monaſtery near

Heſſe-

Heſſe-Caſſel, living under the orders of her ſuperior, and employing herſelf in curious needle works, &c. After her death ſhe was canonized. Being accuſed of incontinence in the life time of her huſband, it is ſaid that ſhe cleared herſelf by walking unhurt over a number of red hot plowſhares. Hugo duke of Burgundy became a monk of Clugny in A. D. 1078. And William duke of Aquitain died in the monaſtic habit in A. D. 1030; as did the emperor Michael the Paphlagonian in A. D. 1041. The emperor Iſaac Commenus became a monk in A. D. 1059, reſigning the empire to Conſtantine Ducas.

Tho' the monks were higher in eſtimation than the ſecular clergy in all this period, they did not gain many eſſential privileges. However, at the council of Niſmes in A. D. 1096, pope Urban aſſerted the right of the monks to the exerciſe of ſacerdotal functions, not only within their own monaſteries, but with reſpect to laymen, which, Fleury ſays, was intirely contrary to the antient cuſtoms.

In England the eſtimation of monks was perhaps higher than in any other part of the world. Before the time of William the Conqueror, monks were ſettled in all the cathedral churches; but this king was an encourager of the ſecular clergy, and Vauquelve biſhop of Wincheſter, taking advantage

tage of this diſpoſition, would have expelled all the monks, but he could not get the conſent of Lanfranc archbiſhop of Canterbury.

A great change took place gradually in the exerciſes and diſcipline of monks, which at this time was very ſtriking. From the time of Lewis le Debonnaire bodily labour came to be conſidered as unworthy of monks, on account of moſt of them being then clergymen. To ſupply this defect of labour, the recitation of pſalms was added to all the offices. Tho' bodily labour was required by the rule of Clugny, Ulric, who gives an account of it, ſays he ſaw nothing of it, but ſhelling beans, weeding the garden, and kneading the bread, and that not every day. They ſung in going to their work, or returning from it, and alſo during the work itſelf. So much devotion, ſays Fleury, was good in itſelf; but it would have been better to have adhered to the antient cuſtoms, ſince ſo many offices leſſened the time for ſtudy, as well as labour, and the offices themſelves were repeated more negligently.

Much account was made of ſilence in this monaſtery, eſpecially at meals. Nothing was ſaid at certain hours, as between *prime* and *tierce*, or between *none* and *veſpres*; and this interval was very ſhort. Nothing was ſaid in the church, the dormitory, the refectory, or the kitchen; and when

when neceſſity required that they ſhould make themſelves underſtood, they did it by means of ſigns.

To give a juſt idea of the character and manners of this age, it will be uſeful to recite the more remarkable inſtances of *auſterity* that occur in the courſe of it; and the high eſteem in which the moſt painful and diſguſting auſteries were held ſhews the prevailing opinions of the times.

Romuald, a famous ſolitary of Lombardy, at the end of the tenth century, ſaid, that he who would be perfect ought to eat every day that he might feel hunger every day. For fifteen years he had been uſed to eat only on ſaturdays and ſundays.

Of Nil, a ſolitary in Calabria, it is ſaid that one year he drank only once a month. He often faſted the whole of Lent, without eating or drinking, except receiving the euchariſt. He ſlept only one hour in the night, and then recited the pſalter, making five hundred genuflexions, after which he ſaid the nocturnal prayers and the matins.

But the greateſt champion of monkiſh auſterity in this or any other age was one Dominic, the friend of P. Damiani biſhop of Oſtia, who publiſhed an account of him. His relations having ſent a buckſkin to a biſhop, in order to get him made a prieſt, he abſtained thro' life from acting

in

in that capacity, and devoted himſelf to the life of a hermit at Luccoli in Umbria, ſubmitting to the directions of P. Damiani, whoſe cell was then near to his own.

For many years he wore next to his ſkin a coat of mail, which he never put off except for the ſake of flagellation, and on this account he got the name of *cuiraſſier*. He never paſſed a day without repeating the pſalter twice, whipping himſelf at the ſame time with both hands, a handful of rods in each. But during Lent, or when he did penance for any other perſon, he repeated at leaſt three pſalters a day, giving himſelf diſcipline in the ſame manner. He often repeated two pſalters without intermiſſion, always diſciplining himſelf, and ſtanding upright, without once ſitting down, or ceaſing one moment to beat himſelf. He made an hundred genuflexions in the recital of every fifteen pſalms, or a thouſand in the whole pſalter. At one time he repeated the whole pſalter eight times in the courſe of a day and night, but then he did not repeat every word audibly, but only mentally. And exerting himſelf to the utmoſt, he once repeated the pſalter twelve times as far as the thirteenth pſalm in one day.

Being informed that by repeating twelve particular pſalms eighty times, and holding the arms in the form of a croſs, a great penance might be redeemed,

deemed, he repeated thoſe twelve pſalms in that manner eighty times without reſting himſelf. In repeating the pſalms, he added the *canticles*, ſeveral other hymns, the Athanaſian creed, and the litany, which were added to the antient pſalters. It was a prevailing opinion that ſince ten years of penance were due for one homicide, twenty homicides would require a hundred years of penance, and that an hundred years of penance might be commuted by the recital of twenty pſalters, accompanied with diſcipline. Alſo three thouſand ſtrokes with a whip were deemed equivalent to a year of penance; and a thouſand laſhes were given in the recital of ten pſalters. Conſequently, the one hundred and fifty pſalms were equivalent to five years of penance, and twenty pſalters to an hundred years. Dominic performed this penance of an hundred years in ſix days. At the beginning of Lent he once required of Damiani to impoſe upon him a penance of a thouſand years, and he had nearly performed it before the end of it.

Beſides his other auſterities, Dominic wore four rings of iron, two on his thighs, and two on his legs; and after ſome time he added four others. Notwithſtanding this ſevere penance, he lived to a great age, and died in A. D. 1062. From his example flagellation, which had been little uſed before,

before, came into fashion with religious people, women as well as men.

Rodolf bishop of Eugubio, another friend of P. Damiani, recited the psalter at least once every day, giving himself discipline with both his hands. He often charged himself with an hundred years of penance, which he performed in twenty days.

Tho' the great lords of this age often made very light of excommunications, and every thing relating to ecclesiastical discipline, we meet with some examples of a rigorous compliance with it. Otho III, as a penance for some crime which he had committed, walked barefoot from Rome to mount Garganus, fasting, and singing psalms all the way, wearing a hair cloth next his skin, tho' over it he wore a garment of gold and purple; and tho' he had a bed of state in his room, he slept on a mat of reeds.

In those superstitious times even the laity, and independently of any penance, were made to restrain the gratification of their appetites, and submit to certain restrictions. Fasting in the forty days of Lent was universally exacted; and marriage could not be celebrated in this season of mortification, even tho' the consummation was deferred till it was over. At a council in Beneventto in A. D. 1091 it was forbidden to celebrate marriage from *Septuagesima*, till the octave of Whitsuntide,

funtide, and alſo from advent to the octave of Epiphany.

Several perſons, and ſome in the higheſt ranks of life, made a merit of living in continence even when they were married. When the emperor Henry II died in A. D. 1024 he ſent for the relations of the empreſs Cunegund, and declared to them, that he reſtored her to them as much a virgin as he had received her. This emperor after his death was canonized. Alſo Edward the Confeſſor of England declared on his death bed, that he had lived with his wife as with a ſiſter.

SECTION V.

Of the Progreſs of Chriſtianity, and of the State of the Jews and Chriſtian Sectaries in this Period.

CHRISTIANITY made ſome progreſs in this period, tho' the manner of its propagation did not much reſemble that in which it was promoted in the primitive times. But at this time it was a very different thing, and every thing relating to it was conducted in a different manner.

In A. D. 965 Miciſlas, duke of Poland, was converted to Chriſtianity in conſequence of his

having married Dobrava, a ſiſter of Boleſlas king of Bohemia, who was a Chriſtian. The apoſtle of the Sclavonic nations in general was Adalbert, the firſt archbiſhop of Magdeburgh, who alſo preached to the Ruſſians. But the converſion of the Ruſſians is moſt properly dated from the reign of Vladimer, who had married a ſiſter of the Greek emperor in A. D. 989. Geiſa, duke of Hungary, who died in A. D. 997, and who had married his ſon Stephen to Giſelle ſiſter of the emperor Henry II, embraced Chriſtianity, and promoted the converſion of his ſubjects, and this was fully accompliſhed by Stephen himſelf. In the time of Conſtantine Monomachus, two chiefs of the Patzinaches, a Scythian nation, became converts to Chriſtianity, in order to be aſſiſted by the emperor againſt their prince who had uſed them ill; ſo that, as Fleury ſays, theſe converſions ſeem to have been a little intereſted.

Tho' there were not many martyrs in theſe converſions, yet a few perſons are mentioned as having ſuffered in conſequence of them. Brunon, who took the name of Boniface, of a noble family in Saxony, was put to death by the Ruſſians, to whom he went to preach in A. D. 1009. * Alſo Adalbert biſhop of Prague was murdered, as he was

* The writer of the notes to Moſheim ſays that he did not ſuffer martyrdom in Ruſſia. Vol. 2. p. 230.

was preaching to the Pruſſians in A. D. 997. And Gotheſchalck, prince of the Sclavi, was killed by his pagan ſubjects, when he was endeavouring to convert them in A. D. 1065. Several others ſuffered with him.

Theſe national converſions could not be ſuppoſed to have been grounded on conviction; and accordingly there occur in this period ſeveral inſtances of relapſes into idolatry. All the time of the Otho's the Sclavi between the Elbe and the Eider made profeſſion of Chriſtianity; but in A. D. 1013 they revolted from their ſubjection to the princes of Saxony, and at the ſame time renounced their religion, tho' they had profeſſed it ſixty years. The exaction of tythes was very near overturning Chriſtianity in Poland in the beginning of the eleventh century. Some of the lords ſaid that this religion was inſupportable, they would not go to church, and driving the prieſts from them, returned to their antient ſuperſtitions. But Boleſlas arreſted the principal of them, and puniſhed them with death. In A. D. 1047 the Hungarians, being diſſatisfied with their king Peter, demanded permiſſion to live as heathens, according to their antient cuſtoms, and to kill the biſhops and prieſts. Their chiefs, it is ſaid, thought proper to comply with their demands, but they were ſoon after brought back to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity.

The Jews were great ſufferers by the prejudice and violence of the Chriſtians in this period. The church of the holy ſepulchre of Jeruſalem being deſtroyed by the Saracens, and, as it was thought, at the inſtigation of the Jews, they were, in the beginning of the eleventh century, perſecuted in a cruel manner in all Chriſtian countries, at leaſt in the Weſt. It was reſolved by common conſent to baniſh them. Many were drowned, and put to death in other ways, and ſome deſtroyed themſelves. The biſhops forbad all Chriſtians having any intercourſe with them. Many to avoid death ſubmitted to be baptized, but ſoon after returned to their former cuſtoms. It appeared, however, that the account of the guilt of the Jews in this buſineſs had no foundation in truth, and the bearer of the letter which produced all the miſchief being diſcovered, he was ſeverely whipped, and confeſſing his crime, was condemned to be burned to death.

In A. D. 1012 the emperor Henry baniſhed all Jews from Mayence. It appears from the letters of Alexander II to the biſhops of Gaul, that thoſe Chriſtians who went to fight againſt the Saracens made a merit of killing the Jews they met with. For this pope praiſes them for protecting the Jews from thoſe perſons, and highly condemns the practice.

The

The cruſaders made a point of maſſacring all the Jews they met with in their paſſage to the holy land. The moſt moderate account ſays that going by Cologn, Mentz, Worms, and Spire, they killed or drowned, from April to July, five thouſand perſons, and compelled great numbers to renounce their religion. Chriſtian hiſtorians ſay that fourteen hundred were burned in Mentz only, and as they made reſiſtance, one half of the city was reduced to aſhes. Thoſe of Worms took refuge with the biſhop, but he would not receive them, except on the condition of their becoming Chriſtians. Thoſe, however, who did ſo abjured Chriſtianity when the ſtorm was over. Many killed themſelves. At Treves the women, ſeeing the cruſaders approach, killed their own children, ſaying it was better to ſend them to Abraham's boſom than abandon them to the Chriſtians. The biſhop of Spire ſhewed more humanity. He not only protected thoſe who took refuge with him, but cauſed ſome of thoſe who perſecuted them to be hanged. The annaliſts of Bavaria ſay that twelve thouſand were killed in their country. Others make this number much greater. This perſecution was not confined to Germany, thro' which the cruſaders paſſed, but was a general one, extending to England, France, Spain, and Italy. With the account of this perſecution the Jewiſh

hiſtorian R. Gans concludes his hiſtory; ſaying the ſtench of it was inſupportable. *Baſnage*, Vol. 9. p. 100. 193. 196. Abarbinel conſiders this as the moſt cruel of all the perſecutions of his nation. A greater number of Jews, he ſays, left Spain on this account than left Egypt under Moſes. Ib. 481.

We cannot expect much calm diſcuſſion of the queſtion between the Jews and Chriſtians in this period; and yet we find ſome recourſe had to argument. In Africa a Jew aſked leave of the Fatemite Calif Mouaz to have a conference with the Chriſtians in his preſence. This was granted, and it is ſaid that the Jew was confuted by Severus, a celebrated doctor among the Jacobites. Several works of this Severus are extant, eſpecially a hiſtory of the patriarchs of Alexandria, now in the public library at Paris.

About the year A. D. 1076, Samuel, a converted Jew of Morocco, wrote a treatiſe addreſſed to another Jew of the name of Iſaac in favour of Chriſtianity; alleging particularly the long continuance of their ſufferings ſince the death of Chriſt, ſo much exceeding that of the Babyloniſh captivity, and diſtinguiſhing the two comings of the Meſſiah. *Pictet*, A. D. 1072.

In the beginning of the eleventh century there were ſeveral eminent Jewiſh doctors in Spain, and among

among them Iſaac Alphoſi, who came from Fez in Africa, and another Iſaac, the ſon of Baruch. *Pictet*, A. D. 1004.

Notwithſtanding the overbearing influence of the church of Rome, ſupported by all the ſecular powers of Europe, there were at all times, and eſpecially in the lower orders of men, thoſe who rejected the doctrines, and refuſed to conform to the diſcipline, of that church. Such were the diſciples of Clement and Adalbert in a preceding period, and ſuch were the Priſcillianiſts in the Weſt, and the Paulicians in the Eaſt. Both theſe ſects were very numerous; and tho' grievouſly perſecuted, they were by no means extinguiſhed. We now find an union probably of both theſe under the appellation of *Manicheans*, in ſeveral parts of France, and it is certain they held ſeveral of the diſtinguiſhing principles of the Gnoſtics, from which thoſe of the Manicheans were a branch. That remains of Priſcillianiſts ſhould now appear in France will not be thought extraordinary, ſince they were not only in Spain, but alſo in the ſouth of France in a former period; but the Paulicians, perſecuted in Aſia Minor, were received in Bulgaria; and when they were driven from thence they went to Italy, and other parts of the Weſt; and thoſe who are now called Manicheans in France are ſaid to have come from Italy. *Moſheim*,

Vol. 2. p. 346. They are frequently called *Poplicani*, which ſome thinks to have been a corruption of *Paulicians* (*Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 347.) and *Patarini*, from *Pataria*, a diſtrict in the duchy of Milan.* This term came at length to be uſed to denote all kinds of heretics. Ib. p. 285. In France they were called *Albigenſes*, not, as has been ſuppoſed, from their chiefly reſiding in the town of Alby, but becauſe their tenets were condemned in a council held there. Ib. p. 347.

We find the firſt diſtinct mention of them in the beginning of the eleventh century. We have no writings of theirs, by which to judge of their principles; but if we may at all depend upon the accounts of their enemies, they rejected the doctrine of the trinity, they diſbelieved the creation of the world, ſuppoſing probably that matter was eternal, and the world formed out of it by ſome evil being. They denied that Chriſt was born of a virgin, by which they meant that his fleſh was not derived from her but was a creation in her womb. They are ſaid alſo to have denied the death and reſurrection of Chriſt, but with reſpect to this it is probable they made the diſtinction of the antient Gnoſtics, believing that he died

* Giannone ſays they were called *Paterini* from their readineſs to ſuffer for their religion. Vol. 1. p. 663.

died only in appearance. But the greateſt offence they gave was their rejecting the miſerable but gainful ſuperſtitions of the times reſpecting the rites of the church, and the powers of the clergy. Baptiſm they ſaid did not waſh away ſin, and they were the firſt who denied it to infants, while they adminiſtered it to adults. *Wall's Hiſtory of Infant baptiſm.* Vol. 2. p. 177.

They maintained that the euchariſtical elements did not become the body and blood of Chriſt by conſecration, and that it was uſeleſs to pray to the ſaints. They condemned marriage from the principle that matter was the ſource of all evil, and that it is our great buſineſs to mortify the body; and they forbad eating fleſh meat. Like the primitive Chriſtians, they were charged, but no doubt falſely, with the promiſcuous uſe of women, and with privately killing young children, and other enormities.

A ſociety of theſe perſons being betrayed by one who belonged to the court of the duke of Normandy (and who had pretended to join them) was brought before the council of Orleans in A. D. 1022; when, being charged with holding the opinions abovementioned, they declared that ſuch had always been their belief, and they hoped that even that aſſembly would embrace their doctrines, as they were the pure truth. Being aſked, among

other queſtions, whether they did not believe that God the Father created every thing out of nothing by his ſon, they replied, "You may tell theſe "tales to thoſe who have earthly thoughts, and "who believe the inventions of carnal men, written "on the ſkins of animals; but it is in vain that "you talk in this manner to us who have the "law written by the ſpirit of God in the inner "man. But make an end, and do with us what-"ever you pleaſe."

The diſputation with them at this council continued from day light till three in the afternoon, when they were threatened with being burned alive if they did not renounce their opinions, but they profeſſed that they did not fear death in any form. After this thoſe of them who were prieſts were formally degraded, and the queen, who had the charge of the door, with her own ring ſtruck out the eye of one of them of the name of Stephen, who had been her own confeſſor. Of thirteen of them only one man, who was of the clergy, and one woman, who is ſaid to have been a nun, recanted; all the reſt went with the greateſt chearfulneſs to the ſtake, and were burned alive. It now appearing that one Theodat, a ſinger in the ſame church, who had been dead three years, was in the ſame hereſy, they dug up his body, refuſing him Chriſtian burial. Others of theſe heretics were

were burned at Thoulouſe, and other places; for they were found in many parts of the Weſt.

More of theſe Manicheans, as they are called, were found at Arras in A. D. 1025, by ſome perſons who came from Italy, when Gerard the biſhop of that city cauſed ſome of them to be ſeized; and after queſtioning them, he put them in priſon. Then, proceeding with great ſolemnity in the buſineſs, he ordered a faſt of his clergy, in order to procure their converſion. On the third day after this, being ſunday, he went in great ſtate to the cathedral church, and delivered a diſcourſe on the ſubject. He then queſtioned them concerning the perſon from whom they learned their tenets, when they mentioned one Gandolf from Italy, ſaying that he taught them to receive no other ſcriptures than the goſpels and the acts of the apoſtles. Having been informed that they rejected baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper, with the other ordinances of the church, he put queſtions to them on thoſe ſubjects, and in reply to what the biſhop had ſaid with reſpect to them, they ſaid, "Our "doctrine conſiſts in abandoning the world, re- "preſſing the deſires of the fleſh, living by the la- "bour of our hands, doing wrong to nobody, and "exerciſing charity towards our brethren. In ob- "ſerving theſe things we think we have no need of "baptiſm, and if we violate theſe things baptiſm "will

"will not avail us." They likewiſe urged the bad lives of the clergy who adminiſtered baptiſm.

To this the biſhop replied with the uſual arguments, alleging the baptiſm of the eunuch and of Cornelius, and ſaying that the unworthineſs of the miniſter does not prevent the efficacy of the ſacrament, &c. &c. Being probably terrified, for we can hardly ſuppoſe that they were really convinced, by what they muſt have often heard before (and from other accounts it appeared that they had been put to the torture, *Pictet*, A. D. 1025.) they acknowledged themſelves to have been in an error, and the biſhop continued his inſtructions on the ſubject of material churches, which they had treated with contempt, as mere heaps of ſtone, together with the altar, the incenſe, and the bells. He alſo explained to his audience the nature and uſe of the eccleſiaſtical orders; for they had deſpiſed all external worſhip, thinking it to be a matter of indifference who were their miniſters, in what place they exerciſed it, or where they buried their dead; funeral ceremonies being the invention of avaricious prieſts. He alſo inſtructed them in the uſe of penance, which he maintained to be ſerviceable even to the dead. For, ſaid he, a perſon may perform the penance which his friend was prevented from doing by death. He defended the neceſſity of grace againſt what he called the falſe righteouſ-

righteouſneſs of theſe heretics; from which it is probable that they had laid great ſtreſs on perſonal virtue, in oppoſition to every thing that ſuperſtition and falſe notions had ſubſtituted in the place of it. On this occaſion he alſo defended the lawfulneſs of marriage, which they were ſaid to have denied. He concluded with pronouncing a ſolemn condemnation of all the articles of their doctrine, and ſent an account of this ſynod, as it is called, to a neighbouring biſhop, who is ſuppoſed to have been that of Liege, to guard him againſt thoſe heretics, who were ſo diſguiſed in his dioceſe as to have paſſed undiſcovered.

The emperor Henry I, finding many of theſe Manicheans at Goſlar, when he celebrated the feſtival of Chriſtmas there in A. D. 1051, by the advice of biſhops and lords who were aſſembled on that occaſion, ordered them to be hanged, leſt their hereſy ſhould extend farther. We ſhall find, however, in the ſubſequent periods of their hiſtory, that this hereſy was not to be prevented from ſpreading by theſe meaſures.

The controverſy that chiefly agitated the Latin church in this period was that with Berenger concerning the euchariſt. He was a native of Tours, and maſter of a ſchool there. He alſo taught in that city after he was made archdeacon of Angers. He ſeems to have imbited ſome of the ſentiments of

of the Manicheans; for he is ſaid to have diſputed againſt the baptiſm of infants, and alſo againſt marriage, as well as to have maintained the doctrine of John Scotus againſt Paſchaſius on the ſubject of the euchariſt. Being oppoſed by Lanfranc, then prior of the abbey of Bec in Normandy, he wrote him a letter of friendly expoſtulation; telling him that if he condemned the opinion of John Scotus, as heretical, he muſt condemn Ambroſe Jerom, Auſtin, and many others.

Berenger was univerſally allowed to be a man of a moſt excellent private character. William of Malmſbury ſays he was regarded by ſome as a ſaint, and commended for having done an infinity of good works. Hildebert biſhop of Mans, who St. Bernard ſays was a man worthy of all reſpect, and a firm pillar of the church, wrote his epitaph; and greater praiſe could not be given to any man than is given to him in it. *Pictet*, A. D. 1050.

The firſt who publiſhed any thing againſt Berenger was Hugo biſhop of Langres, in A. D. 1050, who exhorted him not to maintain ſingular opinions. For, ſays he, you ſee the euchariſt with other eyes than the generality of Chriſtians. By this time the doctrine of Paſchaſius of the real preſence, and the change of the elements into the body and blood of Chriſt, was probably the general opinion, tho' it was a long time in becoming ſo.

Beren-

Berenger's arguments againſt it muſt have made a great impreſſion on many, and have excited much attention. For in a council held at Rome in A. D. 1050 his doctrine was condemned, and himſelf excommunicated. On this he retired to Normandy, where he had conferences on the ſubject of his doctrine with the clergy of Brione, and of Chartres, the former in the preſence of William duke of Normandy. In theſe conferences, far from appearing to have been intimidated by the acts of the late council at Rome, he is ſaid to have treated the church of Rome as heretical, not even excepting pope Leo.

Berenger, continuing refractory, was cited to appear at a council at Verceil in the ſame year, when pope Leo IX preſided; but he did not attend. In this council the treatiſe of John Scotus concerning the euchariſt was read, condemned, and publickly burned; and the opinion of Berenger was alſo cenſured. Two clergymen who then attended for him were ſaid to have been confounded, ſo as to be unable to defend him, and they were arreſted.

Notwithſtanding theſe ſolemn condemnations, the opinion of Berenger continued to ſpread ſo much in France, as to give much alarm. King Henry hearing of it, by the advice of his biſhops and lords, appointed a council to be held on the ſub-

ſubject at Paris, and Berenger himſelf was ordered to attend. He did not, however, go thither, but continued with Brunon biſhop of Langres, who was of the ſame opinion with him; but a letter of his to a friend, which had been intercepted, was read at this council, and was heard with much indignation; and his doctrine and the treatiſe of Scotus were again condemned. In conſequence of this, the king, who was himſelf abbot of St. Martin's at Tours, ordered the revenue of Berenger from that abbey to be withdrawn. On this Berenger wrote a letter of remonſtrance to that prince, by means of a friend, who had acceſs to him, in which he ſaid it was unjuſt in the council of Verceil to condemn John Scotus, who wrote at the requeſt of king Charles the Bald, a prince who had the greateſt zeal for religion, leſt the errors of ignorant and ſtupid people ſhould prevail.

This letter does not appear to have had any effect, and the firmneſs of Berenger did not hold out much longer. For at a council held at Tours in A. D. 1054, where Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII, attended, Berenger and Lanfranc, who was for ſome time ſuſpected of favouring him, being introduced, the former made a public recantation of his doctrine, and was received into communion. Alſo, at another council held in Rome in A. D. 1059, Berenger made a more ſolemn retracta-

tractation of his opinion, declaring that if he ſhould ever think or preach otherwiſe than as the church preſcribed he would ſubmit to the ſeverity of the canons. He even himſelf lighted a fire in the midſt of the council, and threw into it the book which contained his opinions. But as ſoon as he was out of the council he wrote againſt the confeſſion he had there made of his faith, inveighing againſt cardinal Humbert, who had drawn it up for him.

On this occaſion Lanfranc addreſſed an epiſtle to Berenger, particularly reproaching him for teaching in private what for fear of death he had denied before the council; and in reply to Berenger's ſaying that, it was impoſſible that the ſame body of Chriſt could be in heaven at the ſame time that it was eaten by the communicants, he ſaid, "It is a myſtery of faith, uſeful to be believed, "but not uſeful to be examined."

The doctrine of the euchariſt was again diſcuſſed at the council of Rouen in A. D. 1074, and with ſo much warmth that Berenger, who was preſent, was near being killed. And about the ſame time Guimond, a Spaniſh monk and a diſciple of Lanfranc, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by writing againſt Berenger, beginning with reproaching him for his affectation of ſuperior wiſdom, when he was very young. What handle Berenger had given for this does not now appear, nor is it all to

the purpoſe. With reſpect to the argument, what is advanced by Guimond is particularly curious. In anſwer to the objection that all the communicants cannot receive a whole Chriſt, he ſays, that "not only does every ſingle hoſt contain a whole "Chriſt, but every particle of every hoſt; and "tho' a thouſand maſſes were celebrated at the "ſame time, all the communicants receive the one "only indiviſible body of Chriſt. It is," he ſays, "only to the ſenſes that a ſingle particle of a hoſt "ſeems leſs than the whole, but the ſenſes often "deceive us." He owns that it is difficult to *underſtand* this tranſmutation of the elements. But ſays it is not difficult to *believe* it, the only queſtion being whether God wills the change. However he illuſtrates the ſubject by ſaying, that when a man ſpeaks, the ſame voice is heard intire by the greateſt multitude.

Some of the diſciples of Berenger having maintained what they called the doctrine of *impanation*, which was that the real body of Chriſt, and the ſubſtance of bread and wine exiſted together, Guimond replied to them as well as to Berenger himſelf. He ſaid the Berengarians could not be the true church of Chriſt, becauſe they did not occupy a ſingle city, or even a village. The queſtion, he ſays, is of infinite moment, eternal life depending upon it. In the laſt place, he replies to thoſe who

who ſaid that the elements ceaſed to be the body of Chriſt to unworthy communicants. Durandus alſo, the abbot of Trouarn in Normandy, wrote againſt Berenger; but he advanced nothing new. Thus at this time ended the famous controverſy concerning what was afterwards called the doctrine of *tranſubſtantiation*, and which came to be the moſt diſtinguiſhing article of the church of Rome.

But tho' nothing more was *written* in the time of Berenger, ſomething more was *done*. At the council held in Rome in A. D. 1078, being urged to renounce his error, he gave a ſhort confeſſion of his faith, and obtained a delay of his ſentence till the next council in the Lent following. At this council ſome of the biſhops maintained that the elements were only a figure, which looks as if Berenger was not without the ſupport of ſome perſons of eminence in the church; but this opinion was ſet aſide, and it was agreed that the elements were the real body of Chriſt, and Berenger was induced to ſign an ample recantation of all that he had taught to the contrary; and in conſequence of this he was diſmiſſed, and ſolemnly charged to teach nothing more concerning the euchariſt, except with a view to recover thoſe whom he had led into error. But, as before, he was no ſooner in France, than he wrote againſt this laſt confeſſion, as he

had done againſt the former, which had been extorted from him in the ſame manner.

In France Berenger muſt have had many and very powerful friends; for, notwithſtanding his perſiſting in his opinion, we find him at a council at Bourdeaux in A. D. 1080; but what paſſed there is not ſaid, except that he there gave an account of his faith. He lived eight years after this in a ſtate of retirement near Tours, dying in A. D. 1088, and in communion with the church. He was much commended for his charity to the poor, and two of the beſt poets of the age compoſed magnificent epitaphs for him.

The opinion of Berenger did not die with him; for it was thought neceſſary to condemn it once more at the council of Placentia in A. D. 1095, when it was declared that the bread and wine, duly conſecrated at the altar, are not only a figure, but changed truly and eſſentially into the body and blood of Chriſt.

The doctrine concerning the nature of the preſence of Chriſt in the euchariſt was not ſettled in the time of Berenger, and the confeſſions of his faith which he was required to give from time to time varied from each other. He adhered to that which he had ſubſcribed in the two firſt Roman councils approved by Gregory VII. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 338.

Folk-

Folkheim abbot of Lobes, in the biſhoprick of Liege, wrote againſt the real preſence; and Hereger, who ſucceeded him, made a collection of paſſages from the Fathers againſt the doctrine of Paſchaſius. *Pictet*, A. D. 1007.

It is probable that, in this period, there were many of the diſciples of Clement and Adalbert, who refuſed to communicate with the Romiſh church. For at a council held at Amalphi in A. D. 1089, the clergy called *Acephali*, or thoſe who had no connection with the Catholic biſhops were condemned, and alſo ſome vagabond monks.

There was ſome little diſcuſſion of the doctrine of the *trinity* in this period, in conſequence of what was advanced by Roſcellin, a celebrated teacher, but rather of logic, than of theology. He ſaid that the three divine perſons were *three things*, as diſtinct from each other as three angels, tho' they had but one will, and one power. Otherwiſe, he ſaid, it would follow that both the Father and the Holy Spirit muſt have been incarnate, as well as the Son; that, indeed, ſtrictly ſpeaking, they ſhould have been called *three Gods*, but cuſtom had not authorized it. Lanfranc and Anſelm he ſaid were of the ſame opinion. As this was an age in which many perſons began to ſpeculate on metaphyſical and theological ſubjects, this doctrine was conſidered in a council held by Renauld archbiſhop of

Rheims at Compeigne in A. D. 1092, and condemned; and Anſelm, hearing what Roſcellin had ſaid concerning his opinion on the ſubject, ſent to this council to diſclaim it, and vouching the ſame for Lanfranc, who was then dead. He ſaid he ſhould not argue with Roſcellin on the ſubject, giving this curious reaſon for it. "Our faith," he ſaid, "muſt be defended by reaſon againſt infidels, "but not againſt thoſe who bear the name of Chriſtians;" meaning probably that in their caſe it was ſufficient to appeal to the authority of the church, which they allowed. Roſcellin himſelf appeared at this council, and abjured his opinion; but, like Berenger, he ſtill continued to teach it, ſaying he had abjured becauſe he was afraid of being knocked on the head by the populace.

Anſelm, who may be ſaid to have been the father of that ſubtle method of reaſoning on theological ſubjects which, being uſed in ſchools, afterwards obtained the name of *ſcholaſtic*, wrote a treatiſe to ſolve the queſtion, "why God became "man, in order to give life to the world by his "death," when he might have effected the ſame purpoſe by means of an angel, or a mere man, or by his ſole will and power; which ſhews, that the principle of what is now called the doctrine of *atonement* was by no means eſtabliſhed at this time.

Some,

Some, who were called *Anthropomorphites*, were found in this period. For Ratherius, biſhop of Verona, wrote againſt them. This doctrine, it has been ſeen, was held with peculiar obſtinacy by many monks in the Eaſt.

Towards the end of the tenth century an opinion prevailed that the world would come to an end in the year one thouſand after Chriſt. Many of the donations that were made to the church about this time expreſſed this opinion; the writings beginning with the phraſe *the end of the world being at hand, &c.* *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 218. Abbon, the abbot of Fleury at that time, ſays he obſerved this error, and refuted it from the Goſpels, the Revelation, and the book of Daniel.

About the ſame time many perſons, fond of the antient poets, abandoned the ſcriptures, and took their faith from them. This was too alarming an evil to be ſuffered to ſpread. One of theſe perſons was condemned by the biſhop of Ravenna, and others, it is ſaid, were deſtroyed by fire and ſword; but we have no ſatisfactory account of theſe tranſactions. At this time alſo there appeared, as it is ſaid, ſeveral heretics, but their tenets are not mentioned, in Sardinia, "fertile in "ſuch evils, who corrupted ſome Chriſtians in "Spain; but they were exterminated by the Ca-"tholics." This deluge of errors was thought to

be the accompliſhment of the prophecy of St. John, who ſaid that Satan would be let looſe after a thouſand years.

SECTION VI.

Of the Intercourſe between the Greek and Latin Churches in this Period.

SOME communication between the church of Conſtantinople and that of Rome in this period was occaſioned by a letter ſent by Michael Cerularius, patriarch of the former of theſe cities, to John biſhop of Trani in Apulia, in which he reproached the Latins for ſeveral of their cuſtoms, as their uſing unleavened bread in the euchariſt, eating things ſtrangled, and conſequently blood, faſting on ſaturdays, &c. This letter being carried to pope Leo IX, he treated with great indignation this cenſure of the church of Rome, as if they who had been inſtructed by the apoſtle Peter had then to learn how to celebrate the euchariſt. He particularly inſiſted upon the donation of Conſtantine, as an argument for the preeminence of the ſee of Rome, reproached the Greeks for making biſhops of eunuchs, and ſhutting up the churches of the Latins in the Eaſt; whereas the Greeks were per-

permitted to have churches and monaſteries in Rome, where they uſed their own cuſtoms without moleſtation.

At this time, however, the emperor Conſtantine Monomachus, wanting the aſſiſtance of the Weſtern empire to oppoſe the Normans in Italy, wrote to the pope, to expreſs his concern at the difference that ſubſiſted between the two churches; and he obliged the patriarch Michael to write to the pope to the ſame purpoſe. This was towards the end of the year A. D. 1053. In return, the pope ſent three legates, with letters to the emperor and to the patriarch. To the former he expreſſed his ſatisfaction in his overtures for peace and concord, he gave an account of his tranſactions with the Normans, and expreſſed his willingneſs to concur with the emperor in repreſſing them; but he complained of the patriarch Michael, for anathematizing thoſe who adminiſtered the euchariſt with unleavened bread, and for his attempts to bring into ſubjection to himſelf the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria; and added that, if he did not deſiſt from his pretenſions, he could have no peace with him. In his letter to the patriarch he complained of the ſame things in ſtill ſtronger terms. The legates who carried theſe letters were received with every mark of honour; but there was too much pride on both ſides for a reconciliation.

Cardinal Humbert, who was the chief of this embaſſy, on his arrival at Conſtantinople, drew up a long anſwer to all the accuſations of Michael againſt the Latins. On the ſubject of eating things ſtrangled and blood, he denied the charge; ſaying it was only permitted in caſe of famine. At the ſame time he alſo replied to ſomethings that had been written by Nicetas a monk, on the controverſy between the two churches; and becauſe Nicetas had ſaid that communion breaks the faſt, the cardinal concluded that in his opinion the euchariſtical elements were ſubject to the proceſs of digeſtion, and the conſequences of it, like other food; and for holding this opinion, which to him appeared ſo unworthy of a Chriſtian, he called him a *Stercorariſt*. In this treatiſe the cardinal alſo reproached the Greeks with the marriage of their prieſts, and on this account he calls them *Nicolaitans*. For the Greeks allow the marriage of a prieſt to a virgin before their conſecration. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 286.

This controverſy was not calculated to anſwer the purpoſe of the emperor; and by ſome means or other Nicetas was brought to retract every thing that he had written againſt the Latins, in the preſence of the legates and of the emperor, and even to anathematize thoſe who denied that the church of

of Rome was the firſt of all the churches; and after this they received the communion together.

But the patriarch proving more refractory, ſo as even to refuſe to have any communication with the legates, they went to the church of St. Sophia, and in the preſence of the clergy and people laid on the great altar a writing which contained a formal excommunication of him, and then, going out, ſhook off the duſt from their feet. After this, having regulated the Latin churches in Conſtantinople, and pronounced an anathema againſt thoſe who ſhould communicate with any Greek who cenſured the euchariſt of the Latins, they took leave of the emperor with the kiſs of peace. The act of excommunication contained a recital of all the charges of the Latins againſt the Greeks, and among them they particularly mentioned their taking from the creed the words *filioque*, their refuſing baptiſm to children who died before the eighth day, and the communion to women in child bed.

Michael, not intimidated, but greatly provoked at this proceeding, cauſed a copy of the writing which contained the form of excommunication to be publickly burned; and affecting not to believe that the legates were ſent by the pope, he anathematized all thoſe who had adviſed, publiſhed, or written, the excommunication, and all their

accom-

accomplices. In this twelve metropolitans and two archbiſhops concurred with him. The original of the writing was not burned but preſerved, as the patriarch ſaid, for the perpetual condemnation of thoſe who had uttered ſuch blaſphemies; and this anathema of his was ordered to be read every twenty-fourth day of July, being the day on which it was cuſtomary to read the decrees of the five general councils.

Thus ended the intercourſe between the two churches, without producing any advantage to either of them, or in the leaſt degree leading to a reconciliation. In a correſpondence which Michael had with Peter the patriarch of Antioch immediately after this, he enumerated every article of difference between the two churches, magnifying their importance; and ſaying that what was moſt intolerable in the conduct of the legates, was their ſaying they did not come to Conſtantinople to be inſtructed, but to inſtruct, and make us adopt their opinions. At all times, and more eſpecially at this period, the Greeks conſidered the Latins as little better than barbarians; ſo that the pride of the Greek patriarch could not but have been exceedingly hurt by ſuch contemptuous behaviour of thoſe whom he could not but regard with contempt.

Peter,

Peter, to whom Michael addreſſed himſelf on this occaſion, appears to have been a man of more good ſenſe and moderation, and he endeavoured to recommend the ſame pacific principles to his correſpondent; freely telling him, that ſome of his charges were aggravated, and others mere calumnies, and deſiring him to neglect all the reſt, and only lay any ſtreſs on the addition the Latins had made to the creed. The queſtion about leavened or unleavened bread in the euchariſt, he ſaid, was of little conſequence, and ſhould not be inſiſted on, leſt the breach between the two churches, from which innumerable evils had flowed, ſhould be made wider. To this friendly remonſtrance Michael made no particular reply. He only ſaid that he had thought it right to inform him, and the other patriarchs, of his ſituation, that they might better know how to conduct themſelves, if they were applied to on the ſubject.

In Italy every thing was conducted according to the will of the popes. At a council at Bari A. D. 1098, where pope Urban was preſent, and which was attended by one hundred and eighty-three biſhops, among whom was Anſelm, then in a ſtate of exile from England, the queſtion concerning the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit was propoſed by the Greeks, and openly diſcuſſed, they maintaining that it was from the Father only. But the pope

pope himself replied to them, making use of arguments drawn from a treatise which Anselm had just published on the incarnation; and calling Anselm himself to sit near him, and desiring him to speak on the subject, he complied, and delivered himself, it is said, with so much force and perspicuity, that all the assembly was satisfied, and pronounced an anathema against all those who denied that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, and not from the Father only. But this was not in Greece.

SECTION VII.

The History of the first Crusade.

WITHIN this period of my history we have the commencement of a series of military expeditions, of which I must give a brief relation, since they were undertaken on the account of *religion*, such as then chiefly actuated the Christian world. Besides, they were in their own nature very extraordinary, and had many important consequences. The *crusades*, to which I refer, or expeditions made by the Christians of the West, with a view to wrest from the Mahometan powers the possession of Jerusalem and the holy land (to which,

which, as a favourite pilgrimage, there had long been a prodigious reſort) appear the more extraordinary, as, at this time, not only were the European kingdoms in general in a ſtate of war with each other, but even the particular lords in a ſtate of almoſt conſtant hoſtility; ſo that it was not probable they would truſt one another, or agree in any thing. Yet in this caſe, as if they had been all actuated by one ſoul, they at once overlooked all their differences, and united as one man in a ſeries of diſtant and hazardous expeditions. But they were taught to conſider them as of the moſt meritorious nature, and a certain road to heaven, whether, with reſpect to the event, they ſhould be ſucceſsful or not. Fooliſh and ruinous in the extreme as theſe expeditions are now univerſally conſidered, it does not appear that, at that time, or indeed long after, any perſon objected to them; and the habits of warfare, in which all the European ſtates then were, ſufficiently prepared them for this undertaking, and recommended it to them.

The firſt intimation that we meet with of any ſcheme of this kind is in a letter of Gregory VII to king Henry IV, in which he ſays, that he had been applied to by the Chriſtians in the Eaſt, to relieve them from the oppreſſion under which they then groaned, that he had endeavoured to excite

all

all Chriſtians to give their lives for their brethren, that there were already fifty thouſand ready to march if they could have him to lead them, and that he was determined to go in perſon, even to the holy ſepulchre, eſpecially as the Greek church was deſirous of being united to that of Rome, and as almoſt all the Chriſtians in the Eaſt were diſpoſed to receive their faith from it. He therefore aſked the king's advice and aſſiſtance. For, ſays he, if I make this voyage, I muſt leave the Roman church to your care. Having received an embaſſy from the emperor Michael, he ſent legates in return in A. D. 1074; and wrote to all the Chriſtian princes in the Weſt, urging them to march to the aſſiſtance of their brethren in the Eaſt. Such was the ſpirit and magnanimity of this pontiff, that, had it not been for his quarrel with Henry, he would, no doubt, have undertaken, and have gone thro' with, this expedition.

At this time the emperors of the Eaſt being much reduced, both by foreign enemies, and internal diſſentions, they were very deſirous of getting aſſiſtance from the Weſt; and every attempt that they had made for an union of the two churches had never had any other object. At the council of Placentia in A. D. 1094, the emperor Alexis Comnenus ſent embaſſadors to pope Urban, earneſtly begging his aſſiſtance, and that of all Chriſtians

Chriſtians againſt the infidels, and in defence of the church, which was almoſt deſtroyed in the Eaſt. For the Mahometans were advanced almoſt to the very walls of Conſtantinople. The pope did not fail to ſecond this application, ſo that many perſons then took an oath to undertake the expedition, and aid the emperor according to their power.

But the immediate occaſion of the cruſade was a report of the ſtate of Chriſtianity in the Eaſt brought by a hermit of the name of Peter, of the dioceſe of Amiens, a man diſtinguiſhed by his auſterity, who always travelled barefoot, or mounted on an aſs. From a principle of devotion he had made a pilgrimage to viſit our Saviour's ſepulchre at Jeruſalem, where he was much affected to ſee the condition in which he found he holy place there, under the dominion of the Mahometans, the ſituation of the temple occupied by a moſque, and ſtables adjoining to the church of the holy ſepulchre.

Converſing on the ſubject with Simeon the Chriſtian patriarch, he aſked him if there was no remedy for thoſe evils. The patriarch replied, that they had no expectation of any aſſiſtance from the Greeks, who, tho' rich, were not able to defend them; but that there might be ſome hope if the Chriſtians in the Weſt, who were more powerful, would intereſt themſelves in their favour. To this

Peter replied, that if he and his brethren would give him letters to the pope, and the Chriſtian princes, informing them of the true ſtate of things and requeſting their help, he would not only deliver them, but would ſpare no pains to ſolicit ſuccours for them; and to this they readily acceded.

With theſe letters Peter waited on the pope, and with his own hands he delivered the letters addreſſed to the princes of Europe, and he urged not only them, but all perſons wherever he went, to comply with their contents. And ſuch was his zeal and eloquence that by the time which the pope had fixed for a council to meet at Clermont in A. D. 1095, the ſubject had become generally intereſting, and the minds of men were well prepared to receive any propoſal relating to it.

When all buſineſs of an eccleſiaſtical nature was ſettled at this council, the pope addreſſed the numerous aſſembly of biſhops and princes on this ſubject; informing them of the miſerable ſtate of Chriſtianity in the Eaſt, and eſpecially the dangers to which pilgrims were expoſed in viſiting the holy places at Jeruſalem, exhorting them to turn their arms from one another againſt the common enemy of the Chriſtian name, and by this means make ſatisfaction to God for their many murders, ravages, and other crimes; promiſing a full remiſſion of all their ſins, to thoſe who would take arms in this cauſe,

cauſe, and aſſuring them that all their poſſeſſions would be under the protection of the church; for that, if any perſon ſhould diſturb them in their abſence on this expedition, they ſhould be excommunicated till ample ſatisfaction was made; and that the biſhops and prieſts who did not join in this ſhould be ſuſpended from their functions.

Remigius, a monk of Rheims, who was preſent, ſays that when the pope had done ſpeaking, all the aſſembly were ſo moved that, with one voice, they cried *Dieu le volt* (*God wills it*) Silence being obtained, the pope roſe again, and ſaid that this unanimity in their cry muſt have ariſen from inſpiration, and was a ſure omen of their ſucceſs. Thoſe words he ſaid ſhould be thoſe with which they ſhould ruſh to battle. He then ſaid that thoſe who went on the expedition ſhould diſtinguiſh themſelves by wearing a croſs on their garments, and that thoſe who were not able to go in perſon, ſhould aſſiſt by their money, and other means.

When they had received abſolution, and the benediction of the pope, they choſe Adhemar biſhop of Puy, a man well informed in both eccleſiaſtical and civil affairs, for a leader; and when, after ſome difficulty, he accepted the command, the pope gave him the powers of his legate. But ſoon after this they were informed that Raymond count of Thouloufe had taken the croſs, and would

go on the expedition, with many knights; ſo that the cruſade had two leaders, an eccleſiaſtic and a layman. To encourage them, the pope again declared that, they who took the croſs on that occaſion ſhould be excuſed from all other kinds of penance, in conſideration of the danger of fighting, to which they would be expoſed; and he ordered all the biſhops to preach the cruſade in their reſpective dioceſes.

In his future progreſs thro' France, the pope himſelf every where recommended the cruſade; and then he appointed the feſtival of the aſſumption of the virgin in that year for the time of ſetting out. Accordingly, on that day the cruſaders began their march. The principal of them were Hugh, brother of the king of France, and count of Vermandois, Robert duke of Normandy, brother of the king of England, Stephen count of Blois, Raimond count of Thouloufe, Godfrey duke of Lorrain, with his brothers Baldwin and Euſtace, and Baldwin de Bourgh, their couſin. There were many lords of a leſſer rank, and an infinity of the lower nobleſſe. There were alſo biſhops, and at the head of them Adhemar the legate of the cruſade, William biſhop of Orange, many abbots and monks, and even ſome recluſes, who on this great occaſion quitted their cells. Many of the common people, and even women and children, came from all parts, pro-

promiſing to obey, and ſerve the cruſaders on the expedition.

A great advantage accrued ultimately to the community at large from many of the great land-holders on this occaſion ſelling their lands, and often at low prices, in order to equip themſelves for this expedition. However, they chearfully ſold their poſſeſſions, and abandoned their wives and families, with every thing elſe that was dear to them. Public robbers confeſſed their crimes, with a view to make atonement for them in this holy war; ſome debtors went to avoid their creditors; ſome were, no doubt, induced to go from a principle of honour, and ſome were aſhamed to ſtay behind; and many women went in the habit of men.

The firſt that ſet out was Gautier, ſurnamed from his poverty *Sans avoir*, on the 8th of March A. D. 1096, at the head of a great multitude on foot. Paſſing thro' Germany and Hungary, they came to Conſtantinople, followed by Peter the Hermit, with about forty thouſand men from different nations. Many other companies ſet out the ſame ſummer. Peter was followed by a German prieſt of the name of Godeſchalck, with fifteen thouſand men; but ſo ill diſciplined, that they got no farther than Hungary, where they were all cut to pieces. Soon after followed another com-

pany on foot, of about two hundred thouſand, without any chief, and without diſcipline. Theſe fell upon, and without mercy maſſacred, the Jews whereever they came, eſpecially at Cologne and Mentz. Many Jews on this occaſion killed themſelves, and ſome ſubmitted to be baptized in order to ſave their lives.

Robert duke of Normandy, and Stephen count of Blois, went by way of Rome, where they received the pope's benediction. Many of this company went no farther than Rome; others went to Bari, intending to take ſhipping there; but the ſeaſon being unfavourable they were not able to do it, and the duke of Normandy paſſed the winter in Calabria with his countrymen. However, the count of Flanders with his company did croſs the ſea. Robert and Stephen embarked at Brindiſi the fifth of April, which was Eaſterday A. D. 1097. Boemond was beſieging a caſtle in Campania, together with count Roger his uncle, when he heard of the cruſade. On this he took a piece of red cloth, and cutting it into ſmall pieces, he diſtributed it in the form of *croſſes* to his followers, who all inſtantly cried out *God wills it, God wills it*, as at Clermont.

The pope wrote to the emperor Alexis to inform him of the reſolution that had been taken at Clermont, that the cruſaders in all amounted to three

three hundred thouſand men, and that Boemond led ſeven thouſand of approved valour, deſiring him to provide for their ſubſiſtence. But the emperor was alarmed at ſuch an inundation of Barbarians, as the Greeks always conſidered the Weſtern nations to be; and he was more eſpecially afraid of Boemond, whoſe valour he knew by experience. He therefore treated them with every outward mark of honour and reſpect, but privately gave them as much obſtruction as he could. This conduct giving the Latins juſt cauſe of ſuſpicion, thoſe who were encamped near Conſtantinople demoliſhed the houſes in the country, and even ſtripped the churches of their lead, in order to ſell it to the Greeks. This made the emperor expedite their paſſing the Helleſpont. But they behaved no better in Aſia, where they plundered, and burned, both houſes and churches.

Being landed on the ſhore of Aſia, ſeveral of the chiefs held a conſultation about their future progreſs, and in conſequence of it, they laid ſiege to Nice the 14th of May A. D. 1097. Here they reviewed their troops, and found them to be one hundred thouſand armed knights, and, including the foot ſoldiers and the women, they were ſix hundred thouſand. Nice, which was then in the power of Soliman, a Turk of the Seljukian race, ſurrendered by capitulation on the 20th of June,

and was given to Alexis, to the great diſſatisfaction of the army, who expected to plunder it. By the treaty they had made with the emperor, they were to cede to him all the places they ſhould conquer from the infidels, and he was to furniſh them with proviſions. But as he had not performed his part of the agreement, they thought themſelves diſcharged from performing theirs; and therefore in all the places which they took afterwards they put garriſons of their own.

They had taken Tarſus and the reſt of Cilicia when Baldwin brother of duke Godfrey left the grand army, and going to the North, conducted by a noble Armenian, he proceeded as far as the Euphrates. The country, being full of Chriſtians, readily ſubmitted to him, and having taken Edeſſa, he was crowned prince of it, and there founded a powerful ſtate.

The grand army having paſſed thro' Syria, laid ſiege to Antioch on the 21ſt of October A. D. 1097. It was then a large city, inhabited chiefly by Chriſtians, tho' it had been in the poſſeſſion of the Turks fourteen years. After a ſiege of ſeven months it was taken by treachery on the 3d of June A. D. 1098; but the Turks keeping poſſeſſion of the caſtle, and an immenſe army coming to its relief, the Chriſtians were beſieged in the city, and reduced to ſuch diſtreſs that they fed on

their

their horſes and camels. In this ſtate they continued twenty-ſix days, and in all probability would have been all cut off, had it not been for the pretended diſcovery of the lance with which our Saviour's ſide was pierced. Having got poſſeſſion of this, they bid adieu to deſpair, and took an oath that, if God would deliver them from this danger, they would never ſeparate till they had taken Jeruſalem, and delivered the holy ſepulchre. After this they marched out, and defeating the enemy, took their camp, in which they found an immenſe booty. This was the 28th of June A. D. 1098. Boemond remained at the place with the title of prince.

Immediately after the reduction of Antioch a contagious diſorder carried off many of the cruſaders, and among them Adhemar the pope's legate, who was exceedingly regretted. They then wrote to the pope, to give him an account of their proceedings, and to requeſt that he would come in perſon to head them, in the city in which the Chriſtians firſt acquired their name, and in which the apoſtle Peter had his firſt ſee. The pope, however, contented himſelf with ſending them another legate, Daimbert archbiſhop of Piſa.

While they remained here there aroſe a diſpute about the reality of the lance that had been diſcovered; when Peter Barthelemi, who pretended

to have had a revelation which led to it, demanded the proof of the fire ordeal. Accordingly a fire being lighted, he took the lance, and boldly advanced thro' it, ſeemingly ſafe and ſound; but, as he died a few days after, the queſtion remained undecided.

After the taking of Antioch, the cruſaders made ſome other conqueſts, and marching towards Jeruſalem, they arrived there on the 7th of July A. D. 1099; and tho' they were then only twenty thouſand foot, and fifteen hundred horſe, and the city was garriſoned by forty thouſand men, furniſhed with every thing neceſſary, they took it on the 15th of July at three o'clock in the afternoon, which was noticed as being the day and the hour of the death of Chriſt. Godfrey was the firſt to enter the city, together with his brother Euſtace, by getting upon the wall, from a tower which they had brought near it. Preſently after the count of Thouloufe entered at another place, and then the whole army, making a dreadful ſlaughter of the infidels, of whom they killed about ten thouſand in the moſque which was ſituated on the ruins of the temple, and as many in other places.

Being now in poſſeſſion of the place, the great object of the expedition, they bathed themſelves, and marched barefoot, groaning and ſhedding many tears, till they came to the holy ſepulchre, where

where they were met by the Chriſtians in the place ſinging hymns. It was a wonderful ſpectacle, ſay thoſe who were preſent, to ſee with what devotion the cruſaders viſited the holy places, ſome on their bare knees, and all of them endeavouring to exceed the reſt in what was conſidered as an act of religion. The biſhops and prieſts then performed maſs in the church, praying for the people, and giving thanks to God for ſuch great ſucceſs. The day of this conqueſt was then ordered to be celebrated by a ſolemn feſtival every year.

Eight days after this Godfrey was choſen king of Jeruſalem, and being, on this occaſion, offered a crown of gold, he replied, that he could not wear a crown of gold in that city in which the king of kings had been crowned with thorns. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 237. After ſome diſpute, Daimbert the legate was choſen patriarch, the former patriarch Simeon being then in Cyprus, and ignorant of all that had paſſed. From Daimbert Godfrey received the inveſtiture of the kingdom of Jeruſalem, as Boemond did that of Antioch. After the return of the greater part of the cruſaders, who had now accompliſhed their vows, Godfrey and Tancred, who remained with him, had no more than three hundred horſe, and two thouſand foot. The cities ſubject to them were very few, and ſeparated from one another by places in the poſſeſſion of the Maho-

Mahometans, who killed, or made ſlaves of, them whenever they took any of them. They alſo abandoned the cultivation of the ground; not caring if they ſtarved themſelves, provided they could famiſh the Chriſtians. The Franks were no where ſafe except in cities, very well fortified, being liable to be plundered in the night, and murdered even in their houſes. Such was the beginning of the kingdom of Jeruſalem, which, however, ſubſiſted eighty-eight years.

SECTION VIII.

Articles relating to the public Offices, and Diſcipline.

THE articles under this title that occur in the courſe of the preſent period are not of much importance, but they are ſufficiently numerous to require a ſection for themſelves.

We have ſeen in a former period the deſire of ſome popes to forbid the uſe of the living languages in the offices of public worſhip, and we find the ſame in this. Pope John XII, in order to prevent the Bohemians from uſing the Greek ritual, as the Bulgarians and Ruſſians did, charged the prince not to uſe the Sclavonic tongue in divine ſervice,

ſervice, but the Latin, which accordingly he did. Alſo Gregory VII abſolutely refuſed Wratiſlas king of Bohemia the uſe of that language, for the ſame purpoſe, tho' the people had requeſted it; ſaying it was the will of God that ſome things ſhould remain in obſcurity, leſt they ſhould be deſpiſed by the common people; that antient cuſtom was no excuſe, ſince the primitive church had diſſembled many things, which were corrected afterwards, when religion was more confirmed, and extended. "Wherefore," ſays he, "we com-"mand you by the authority of St. Peter, to op-"poſe with all your might the imprudent requeſt "of your ſubjects."

This pope ſhewed the ſame zeal for the introduction of the Roman ritual into Spain. This had been done partially before, in a former period. And it had been agreed on at a council held at Yacca in A. D. 1060. In A. D. 1080 it was received by Sancho, the firſt king of Arragon, and after ſome threatening on the part of Gregory VII, it was alſo received by Alphonſus IV king of Leon and Caſtile. This, however, the king was not able to accompliſh without difficulty, on account of the oppoſition that was made to it by the clergy, and even the nobility and common people. After ſome diſpute on the ſubject, it was agreed to decide the buſineſs by appointing champions

to

to fight for the two rituals. Tho' the king's champion was defeated, his queen would not allow him to give up the point till they tried the ordeal of fire; when, it is ſaid, both the miſſals being thrown into the ſame fire, that of Spain, or the Moſarabic, was not injured, but the Roman was conſumed. Still, the king would not yield, but ordered the Roman ritual to be uſed in his dominions. Many churches, however, retained their former offices. This is the ſtory related by Rodriguez archbiſhop of Toledo, but who lived one hundred and fifty years after the event.

The Roman ritual was not, in all reſpects the ſame that was uſed in other churches; as the creed was not recited in divine ſervice. When the emperor Henry II was crowned at Rome, he aſked the reaſon of this, and was anſwered, that as there had not been any hereſy at Rome, there was no occaſion for it. At the requeſt of the emperor, it was recited at a ſolemn maſs.

A new feſtival, that of *all the faithful dead from the beginning of the world to the end of it*, was introduced in this period, by Odilon abbot of Clugny. It ſoon paſſed into other churches, and afterwards into all Catholic churches.

It

It appears by the offering of king Robert to the church of St. Agnes in Orleans in A. D. 1029, that the dedication of bells was then called *baptiſm*, and that oil and chriſm were uſed on the occaſion. In A. D. 968 John XIII conſecrated the great bell of the Lateran church at Rome. *Bingham*, Vol. 1. p. 316.

It was about the end of the eleventh, or the beginning of the twelfth century, that *ſmall wafers* were uſed in the adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper. It was a curious conceit of Durandus to ſay, that they ought to be made in the form of denarii, becauſe Chriſt was ſold for thirty of thoſe pieces of ſilver. *Pictet*, A. D. 1054. At this time all communion was in both kinds.

In the tenth century the conſecration of the elements began to be made with a low voice. *Bingham*, Vol. 1. p. 767.

It appears by the writings of Fulbert, in the beginning of the eleventh century, that it was the cuſtom for prieſts, at their ordination, to receive from the biſhop one hoſt, of which they took a part every day, ſo as to conſume the whole in forty days, in imitation of our Saviour's appearing to his diſciples forty days after his reſurrection. In ſome churches a hoſt ſerved them ſeven days.

The

The diſcipline of *penance* was a great article in the religion of thoſe times, and a ſource of great gain to the prieſts. In this period we firſt read of the *commutation of penance*. By a law of king Edgar, in the time of Dunſtan, a faſt of one day was valued at a denier (penny) which was ſufficient for the maintenance of one man. A day of faſting might alſo be redeemed by the recital of two hundred and twenty pſalms, or ſix genuflexions, and one hundred and ſixty paternoſters, that is, the recital of the Lords prayer. One maſs was equivalent to twelve days of faſting. A rich man might relieve himſelf by making other perſons faſt for him, ſo as to accompliſh in three days a faſt of ſeven years; but then, beſides this, he was preſcribed many painful exerciſes, and great alms. It was the cuſtom alſo to commute penances for ſums of money, and land given to the church, which was a great means of enriching it.

Burchard biſhop of Worms compoſed a book of canons to direct the impoſition of penance, and the compenſation for it. According to his rules, a perſon who could not faſt for one day with bread and water was to ſing fifty pſalms on his knees in the church, and maintain a poor man that day, when he might take any nouriſhment, except wine, fleſh, or fat. An hundred genuflexions were equi-

equivalent to fifty pſalms, and the rich might redeem that with money. But theſe redemptions were allowed only when the penance could not be complied with. Some time before this penances performed by others were condemned at a national council in England in A. D. 747, becauſe it was ſaid, that if they were admitted, ſalvation would be more eaſy to the rich than to the poor, contrary to the expreſs declaration of the goſpel.

There are, ſays Fleury, no inſtances of voluntary flagellation before the eleventh century. This flagellation in public was oppoſed by Stephen, who had been a monk of Mount Caſſin; but he dying ſuddenly afterwards, P. Damiani the great advocate for this practice, ſaid it might be a puniſhment for that offence; tho' in other reſpects he was a worthy man.

Theſe articles relating to penance naturally lead to the mention of various other ſuperſtitious practices, and the opinions on which they were founded.

The invention of the *roſary*, conſiſting of a number of beads on a ſtring, is aſcribed to this period, in order to keep an account of the number of prayers, and ſalutations of the virgin which perſons were to repeat. A compleat roſary conſiſted of fifteen repetitions of the Lord's prayer and one hundred and fifty ſalutations of the virgin; and

what was called *the crown* conſiſted of ſix or ſeven repetitions of the Lord's prayer and ten times as many ſalutations. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 224.

Ratherius, biſhop of Verdun, ſpeaks of ſome perſons who attended maſs on mondays, in preference to other days, becauſe on that day the angel Michael celebrated maſs before God. Damiani mentions it as the pious opinion of many eminent perſons, that the ſouls of the dead do not ſuffer on ſundays, and that on this account they ſaid maſs in honour of the angels, to engage their protection of the dead, and thoſe who were to die.

Robert king of France, to prevent the guilt of perjury, which was then very common, made the lords ſwear on a chriſtal *reliquiare*, ornamented with gold, but without any relics in it; and another of ſilver, in which was the egg of a griffon; as if the validity of the oath, ſays Fleury, depended upon the relicks on which it was then the cuſtom to ſwear.

At the council of Airy in A. D. 1020 it began to be the cuſtom to take relicks to councils, in order to add to their ſolemnity and obligation. *Pictet.*

As an inſtance of the moſt elaborate ſuperſtition that I have met with in this period, I ſhall mention the manner in which the wafers for communion were prepared at the monaſtery of Clugny.

ny. They took the beſt corn, which they choſe grain by grain. They then waſhed it carefully, and put it into a ſack, which was kept for the purpoſe. A ſervitor of approved purity carried it to the mill, every thing belonging to which was waſhed. He then put on a garment called the *albe*, and an *amict*, which covered his head and face to the eyes. In this manner he ground the corn, and ſifted the flour. Two prieſts and two deacons, clothed in the ſame manner, kneaded the dough in cold water, that it might be more white, and they formed the wafers; a novice held the marked iron on which they were baked, and they ſung pſalms during this labour, which was always performed before dinner.

That ſuperſtition takes the place of moral virtue, we ſee exemplified every day; but that it ſhould lead to the commiſſion of actual crimes, is not ſo common. Yet in this period the Celtiberians, fearing that St. Romuald, a famous hermit, would leave their country, after having in vain endeavoured to detain him with them, formed a deſign to murder him, that at leaſt they might have his relicks, for the protection of their country.

Superſtition, however, was often a great and ſucceſsful excitement to valour in battle, and the Normans after they embraced Chriſtianity, were particularly diſtinguiſhed for it. Robert Guiſcard

paſſed the night before a battle which he fought in Epirus, with all his army, in the church of the martyr Theodore, where they received the communion. In a ſimilar manner did William the Conqueror prepare his army before the battle of Haſtings, by which he gained the crown of England.

It is, however, to the credit of this period, that in it Agobard wrote a treatiſe againſt the ordeal, and other kinds of ſuperſtition which prevailed in his time. *Pictet*, A. D. 1002.

SECTION IX.

Miſcellaneous Articles.

IN this period we ſee more of the dawning of arts and ſciences, and of literature in general, than could well have been expected from the complexion of it in other reſpects.

1. In the beginning of the eleventh century Guido, a monk of Arezzo, invented theuſe of notes in muſic, by means of which it was ſaid that a child might learn in a few months what a man had not been able to learn in ſeveral years, which was of great conſequence with reſpect to church muſic. The author of this ingenious art, writing concerning

ing it to a monk of Pompoſia, who had aſſiſted him in it, he ſays, whether ſeriouſly or in pleaſantry, does not appear, "I hope that they who "come after us will pray for the remiſſion of our "ſins; ſince, inſtead of ten years, in which it was "difficult to obtain an imperfect knowledge of "pſalmody, we now make a chanter in one year, "or at moſt in two." He ſays that pope John XIX ſent for him, and was wonderfully pleaſed with his invention.

Tho' the *gamut* was not wholly of Guido's invention, he greatly improved it, by affixing to the letters certain ſyllables, extracted from a hymn to John the Baptiſt for the purpoſe of intonation, which was the origin of *ſolfaing*. He alſo reduced the ſtave to four lines, by uſing the intermediate ſpaces together with them, at the ſame time prefixing certain letters, viz. F and C at the beginning, which was the origin of *cliffs*. *Williams*, p. 39.

The diſputes between the Greek and Latin churches, and alſo thoſe between the popes and the emperors, in this period, were the means of promoting inquiry and diſcuſſion, and of many perſons applying to literature. The ſtudy of divinity was particularly attended to by the monks of Mount Caſſin, at firſt by having recourſe to the Fathers, but afterwards in a more logical way;

the works of Ariſtotle having been introduced among Chriſtians by the Arabs. *Giannone*, Vol. 1. p. 487.

In A. D. 820 the Caliph Almamon applied to the emperor at Conſtantinople for books in the Greek language, and thoſe he got tranſlated into Arabic; but the Arabs confined themſelves to books relating to mathematics, natural philoſophy, and medicine. They particularly attached themſelves to the works of Ariſtotle, Hippocrates, and Galen. Many of theſe books Charlemagne and others got tranſlated from Arabic into Latin; and ſoon after ſchools were inſtituted in which this kind of knowledge was taught. Salerno was particularly diſtinguiſhed for Arabic literature, in conſequence of the eaſy acceſs to this place from the Eaſt and from Africa. On this account it ſoon had the greateſt reputation of any ſchool in Europe, eſpecially for medicine. *Giannone*, Vol. 1. p. 489. Gerbert a native of France, afterwards pope Silveſter II, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his application to this kind of literature, eſpecially mathematics and aſtronomy, which he derived from the Arabs in Spain, having ſpent ſome time in the univerſity of Cordova and Seville; and his example induced many to apply to the ſame ſource of information. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 199.

2. Lanfranc was a great reſtorer of letters in Normandy. Many ſtudied under him at the monaſtery

naſtery of Bec, eſpecially Anſelm, his ſucceſſor in the ſee of Canterbury. Anſelm was, without diſpute, the beſt metaphyſican the church had ever had before him, at leaſt ſince Auſtin, as his writings now extant teſtify. In one of his works he gives the metaphyſical arguments for the being of God, and went before Clark in the ſubtle but unſatisfactory arguments *a priori*. "God," ſays he, "muſt neceſſarily have exiſtence; for he is "poſſeſſed of all perfections, and *exiſtence* cannot "be denied to be one."

Odo, before he was made abbot of St. Martin's at Tournay, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by teaching the ſciences. He chiefly excelled in logic, of which he compoſed three books. Following the doctrine of Boethius, and the antients, he maintained, that the object of this art was *things*, and not *words*, as ſome of the more moderns, boaſting to follow Porphyry and Ariſtotle, pretended. Of this claſs was Rainbert, who taught logic at Liſle, and decried the doctrine of Odo. This was the commencement of the two ſects of *Nominaliſts* and *Realiſts*, ſo famous in the ſchools afterwards.

We find ſome perſons beginning to collect books, and form libraries. Bouchard biſhop of Worms, in the beginning of the eleventh century, had more than an hundred volumes of eccleſiaſtical

authors, and an hundred and fifty of profane writers, which was then conſidered as a great library.

At what time the bible was divided into chapters as now in uſe does not appear; but Humbert, legate from pope Leo IX in A. D. 1054, quotes thoſe of the old teſtament as they now are. The diviſion into verſes was made by R. Stephens after the revival of letters.

3. Architecture, and other ornamental arts, had been neglected in Italy more than five hundred years before the time of Deſiderius, who rebuilt the monaſtery of Mount Caſſin; ſo that he was obliged to ſend for workmen from Conſtantinople.

4. It will give my readers ſome idea of the nature of the legends, or fabulous lives of ſaints and martyrs, which were impoſed on the world in ignorant and credulous ages, to be told that at the council of Limoges in A. D. 1031, it was ſolemnly diſcuſſed whether St. Martial ſhould be ranked among the *apoſtles*, or *confeſſors*; when, as Fleury ſays, his whole hiſtory was founded on a legend, compoſed under the name of one of his diſciples called Aurelian, and which was not known before the tenth century. In this hiſtory it was ſaid that Martial was a relation of St. Peter and St. Stephen, that by the order of Chriſt he was

was baptized by Peter himſelf, that he was made a biſhop by Chriſt after his aſcenſion, and ſent by him into Gaul, after he had received the Holy Spirit at the day of Pentecoſt. The debate terminated with his being called *an apoſtle*. But when the archbiſhop Aimon, who preſided, was proceeding to pronounce an anathema againſt thoſe who denied it, the biſhop of Limoges, who had contended for his being only a confeſſor, obtained a delay of the ſentence. *Fleury*, Vol. 12. p. 487.

5. In this age the trial by *ordeal*, received immediately from the Northern nations of Europe, but which came originally from the Eaſt, where it is practiſed to this day, was in the greateſt credit, notwithſtanding the decrees of councils and popes againſt the uſe of it; and in this period occurred (as was recited in *Section* III) a caſe of a ſeeming miracle by means of it, perhaps the beſt atteſted of any ſince the age of the apoſtles. With reſpect to it I would obſerve that Mr. Fleury copied this account from a letter of the people and clergy of Florence to pope Alexander II; but tho' it is ſaid by Mr. Berington, in the *Introduction* to his *Hiſtory of Abelard*, to be atteſted by the hiſtorians of the age, it is probable that they all had it from this one ſource.

Improbable as it muſt appear *a priori*, that the divine Being ſhould give countenance to ſuch

a practice as this, the fact is certainly not impoſſible. But when it is conſidered that all the people of Florence, their magiſtrates, and the monks, were intereſted in the ſucceſs of the trial; and that the only account we have of it was drawn up by themſelves, ſome doubt will remain both with reſpect to the circumſtances previous to the trial, and the iſſue of it; ſo that the chance of ſafety might be ſomething greater than is repreſented, and the monk might not have come off quite ſo well. Nothing alſo is ſaid of the direction of the wind, or of there being any current of the air, at the time, and much would depend upon that. Beſides, if a real miracle was depended upon, why was not the monk placed in the middle of a burning pile, and made to continue there till it was burned out. Why had he any chance of eſcaping unhurt, which the diſtance of the burning piles certainly gave him.

To gain our entire credit, the miracle ſhould have been performed in the preſence of the enemies as well as of the friends to the iſſue of it; and if they did not join in the report, it ſhould appear from the circumſtances that they were unable to contradict it. The biſhop's reſignation might ariſe from the conſciouſneſs of his guilt, and of his extreme unpopularity, without any conviction of the truth of the miracle.

Moſheim

Moſheim makes no mention of this extraordinary fact, and Baronius places it in A. D. 1063, and not in 1075 where Fleury, followed by Mr. Berington, places it; a difference ſufficiently remarkable. The truth of Chriſtianity does not reſt on ſuch miracles as theſe.

This, too, was very different from the caſe of Shadrach Meſhach and Abednego at Babylon, when their enemies who threw them into the furnace were conſumed; and when, after continuing evidently a conſiderable time, the king himſelf ordered them to come out, and then made a ſolemn decree, in favour of their religion; reciting, and acknowledging, the miracle as the occaſion of it.

Succeſsful and ſatisfactory as the iſſue of this trial by ordeal is ſaid to have been, it does not appear that more recourſe was had to it afterwards, tho', no doubt, many ſimilar occaſions muſt have occurred.

The End of the first Volume of the second Part.

BW901 .P94 v.3
A general history of the Christian
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00078 0777